THE OVERTHROW OF THE WAR SYSTEM

BY

JANE ADDAMS
FANNIE FERN ANDREWS
LUCIA AMES MEAD
ROSE DABNEY FORBES
DENYS P. MYERS
RUBY G. SMITH, PH.D.
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER

LUCIA AMES MEAD
EDITOR

THE FORUM PUBLICATIONS
OF BOSTON
1915

Copyright, 1915, by
J. A. HAIEN

All Rights Reserved

FOREWORD

The pall of persecution which for centuries hung over witch and heretic vanished with the eighteenth century. The whip and slave block vanished with the next century. If America has the moral power to rise to her opportunity, the twentieth century may banish the accursed war system from an imperiled world.

The press is spreading millions of pages of censored war-news before dazed and weary readers, too numb or too unimaginative to feel. The publishers have issued two thousand books upon the war. Why add another to the list? Because, peradventure, it may meet some of the multitudes who need help to interpret in terms of duty the stunning phenomenon before their eyes and who grope shortsightedly through myriads of facts to find any vital truth to guide their immediate action. Hundreds of public meetings have sent them away pitifully ignorant that there stands waiting for them a task that calls with trumpet tones for instant activity of mind and heart and tongue. The

summons is to study the remedy for the world's present woe and then to help create a public opinion that may save the world ere exhaustion, bitterness and bankruptcy leave Christendom lower than heathendom.

The following pages have been written with a modest hope that a small, untechnical book, written by those who are largely giving their lives to the greatest problems before humanity, might stir the hopeless and help the bewildered. Millions would respond had they hope that there was anything valid which non-voters or average men could do. To all these, and especially to the nearly two million women who in organized clubs have leisure for study, we urge that the critical situation and America's obligation take precedence of those minor matters that we have with us always. Let the economic illusions and the hoary fallacies that are the cause of every war be examined. Let the most time be spent not on unrelated details but on the philosophy of all war and its remedy—world organization. The Minimum Program and other programs in the appendix deserve careful study. They contain the quintessence of the best thought of many experts and, though coming from different lands, are strikingly harmonious. From these it will be seen that the plans presented aim not

to abolish all force but to diminish it to the minimum that gives sanction to law.

World peace means no flaccid, monotonous, tame existence, as military visionaries conceive. It means all the superb energy of the engineer, the inventor, the scientist, the explorer and the statesman made a thousand times more fruitful. It means, not merely no war, but a new conception of economics, politics and world relationships, which, nevertheless, in every nation will leave varieties of government, custom and religion untouched. The scoffer who flatters himself that he understands the new peace movement, which he imagines is still typified by the antiquated dove and olive leaf and is advocated by "peace at any price" weaklings, has yet to learn the alphabet of the subject.

All but one of the chapters in this book have been written by women who are active in the Woman's Peace Party, four of whom were on its platform committee and two of whom took a leading part in the Woman's Congress at The Hague. The valuable contribution from Professor Balch of Wellesley College was unfortunately unavailable until the book was already in type and was therefore of necessity placed in the appendix. Those who have written these pages are aiming primarily at international jus-

tice and at peace as its by-product. They consider peace as much more than a surcease of war. "Peace as understood by Pacifism means a condition of organized living together among nations." This condition is far more immediately attainable than is the brotherhood of man. It demands no essential change of human nature. It demands organization which shall create in essence such relation ultimately between nations as exists between our States. This relation has not yet brought human brotherhood or even industrial justice, or civic righteousness. But it has set free a million beneficent activities which would never have been born had forty-eight series of custom-houses, armies, forts and arsenals blocked the way to friendly coöperation between our States.

The greatest glory of the United States is that it has shown the way to a United World.

L. A. M.

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD v

CHAPTER

I WOMEN AND WAR, ADDRESS GIVEN AT THE HAGUE, MAY, 1915 1
BY JANE ADDAMS

II THE EDUCATION OF THE WORLD FOR A PERMANENT PEACE 19
BY FANNIE FERN ANDREWS

III THE IMMEDIATE DUTY OF AMERICAN PATRIOTS . 36
BY LUCIA AMES MEAD

IV ORGANIZED WAR ON WAR, AND SOME POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS 55
BY ROSE DABNEY FORBES
(MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES)

V SOME ASPECTS OF THE ECONOMICS OF WAR . . 73
BY DENYS P. MYERS

VI RACE PROBLEMS OF WORLD CONTACT 87
BY RUBY G. SMITH, PH.D.

VII MORAL AND RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE WAR AGAINST WAR 103
BY ANNA GARLIN SPENCER

CONTENTS

APPENDICES.

		PAGE
A	Constructive Plans for Permanent Peace	117
B	A League to Enforce Peace	118
C	Extracts from Address of Edward A. Filene	120
D	Summary of the Chief Resolutions and Recommendations of the International Congress of Women at The Hague, April 28—May 1	123
E	Minimum Program	123
F	Program for Constructive Peace of the Woman's Peace Party	125
G	Union of Democratic Control. Its Four Cardinal Points	128
H	Racial Contacts and Cohesions. As Factors in the Unconstrained Fabric of a World at Peace By Emily Greene Balch	129
I	Addresses of Peace Organizations that are Referred to in Chapter IV	137

THE OVERTHROW OF THE WAR SYSTEM

CHAPTER I

Women and War, Address Given at The Hague, May, 1915.

BY JANE ADDAMS

At this last evening of the International Congress of Women, now drawing to its successful conclusion, its president wishes first to express her sincere admiration for the women who have come here from the belligerent nations. They have come from home at a moment when the national consciousness is so welling up from each heart and overflowing into the consciousness of others that the individual loses, not only all concern for his personal welfare, but for his convictions as well and gladly merges all he has into his country's existence.

It is a high and precious moment in human

experience; war is too great a price to pay for it but it is worth almost anything else. I therefore venture to call the journey of these women, many of them heartsick and sorrowful, to this Congress, little short of an act of heroism. Even to appear to differ from those she loves in the hour of their affliction or exaltation, has ever been the supreme test of woman's conscience.

For the women coming from neutral nations there have also been supreme difficulties. In some of these countries, woman has a large measure of political responsibility and, in all of them, women for long months have been sensitive to the complicated political conditions which may also easily compromise a neutral nation and jeopardize the peace and safety of its people. At a Congress such as this, an exaggerated word may easily be spoken or reported as spoken which would make a difficult situation still more difficult; but these women have bravely taken that risk and made the moral venture. We from the United States, who have made the longest journey and are therefore freest from these entanglements, can speak out our admiration for these fine women from the neutral as well as from the fighting nations.

Spiritual internationalism

Why then were women from both the warring and the neutral nations ready to come to this Congress to the number of 1500? By what profound and spiritual forces were they impelled, at this moment when the spirit of Internationalism is apparently broken down, to believe that the solidarity of women would hold fast and that through them, as through a precious instrument, they would be able to declare the reality of those basic human experiences ever perpetuating and cherishing the race, and courageously to set them over against the superficial and hot impulses which have so often led to warfare.

Those great underlying forces, in response to which so many women have come here, belong to the human race as a whole and constitute a spiritual internationalism which surrounds and completes our national life, even as our national life itself surrounds and completes our family life; they do not conflict with patriotism on one side any more than family devotion conflicts with it upon the other.

New channels needed

We have come to this International Congress of women not only to protest from our hearts

and with the utmost patience we can command, unaffrighted even by the "difficult and technical," to study this complicated modern world of ours now so sadly at war itself; but furthermore we would fain suggest ways by which this large internationalism may find itself and dig new channels through which it may flow.

At moments it appears as if the excessive nationalistic feeling expressing itself during these fateful months through the exaltation of warfare in so many of the great nations, is due to the accumulation within their own borders of those higher human affections which should have had an outlet into the larger life of the world but could not, because no international devices had been provided for such expression. No great central authority could deal with this sum of human will, as a scientist deals with the body of knowledge in his subject irrespective of its national origins, and the nations themselves became congested, as it were, and inevitably grew confused between what was legitimate patriotism and those universal emotions which have nothing to do with national frontiers.

Unnecessary mental conflict

We are happy that the Congress has met at The Hague. Thirty years ago I came to this beautiful city, full fifteen years before the plans for international organization had found expression here. If I can look back to such wonderful beginnings in my own lifetime, who shall say that the younger women on this platform may not see the completion of an international organization which shall make war impossible because good will and just dealing between nations shall have found an ordered method of expression?

We have many evidences at the present moment that, inchoate and unorganized as it is, it may be found even in the midst of this war constantly breaking through its national bounds. The very soldiers in the opposing trenches have to be moved about from time to time lest they come to know each other, not as the enemy but as individuals, and a sense of comradeship overwhelm their power to fight.

This totally unnecessary conflict between the great issues of internationalism and of patriotism rages all about us even in our own minds so that we wage a veritable civil war within ourselves. These two great affections should

never have been set one against the other; it is too late in the day for war. For decades, the lives of all the peoples of the world have been revealed to us through the products of commerce, news agencies, through popular songs and novels, through photographers and cinematographs, and last of all through the interpretations of the poets and artists.

Suddenly all these wonderful agencies are applied to the hideous business of uncovering the details of warfare.

Solemn protest

Never before has the world known so fearfully and so minutely what war means to the soldier himself, to women and children, to that civilization which is the common heritage of all mankind. All this intimate and realistic knowledge of war is recorded upon human hearts more highly sensitized than ever before in the history of man and filled with a new and avid hunger for brotherhood.

In the shadow of this intolerable knowledge, we, the women of this International Congress, have come together to make our solemn protest against that of which we know.

Our protest may be feeble but the world progresses, in the slow and halting manner in

which it does progress, only in proportion to the moral energy exerted by the men and women living in it; social advance must be pushed forward by the human will and understanding united for conscious ends. The slow progress towards juster international relations may be traced to the distinguished jurist of the Netherlands, Grotius, whose honored grave is but a few miles from here; to the great German, Immanuel Kant, who lifted the subject of "Eternal Peace" high above even philosophical controversy; to Count Tolstoy, of Russia, who so trenchantly set forth in our own day, and so on from one country to another.

Each in his own time, because he placed law above force, was called a dreamer and a coward, but each did his utmost to express clearly the truth that was in him and beyond that human effort can not go.

Woman's sympathy

These mighty names are but the outstanding witnesses among the host of men and women who have made their obscure contributions to the same great end.

Conscious of our own shortcomings and not without a sense of complicity in the present war, we women have met in earnestness and in

sorrow to add what we may to this swelling tide of purpose.

It is possible that the appeal for the organization of the world upon peaceful lines has been made too exclusively to man's reason and sense of justice, quite as the eighteenth century enthusiasm for humanity was prematurely founded on intellectual sentiment. Reason is only a part of the human endowment; emotion and deep-set racial impulses must be utilized as well—those primitive human urgings to foster life and to protect the hopeless, of which women were the earliest custodians, and even the social and gregarious instincts that we share with the animals themselves. These universal desires must be given opportunities to expand and the most highly trained intellects must serve them rather than the technique of war and diplomacy.

They tell us that wounded lads lying in helpless pain and waiting too long for the field ambulance, call out constantly for their mothers, impotently beseeching them for help; during this Congress we have been told of soldiers who say to their hospital nurses, "We can do nothing for ourselves, but go back to the trenches again and again so long as we are able. Can not the women do something about this war? Are you kind to us only when we are wounded?"

Woman's responsibility

The time may come when the exhausted survivors of the war may well reproach women for their inaction during this terrible time. It is possible they will then say that when devotion to the ideals of patriotism drove thousands of men into international warfare, the women refused to accept the challenge and in that moment of terror failed to assert clearly and courageously the sanctity of human life, the reality of things of the spirit.

For three days we have met together, so conscious of the bloodshed and desolation surrounding us, that all irrevelant and temporary matters fell away and we spoke solemnly to each other of the great and eternal issues, as do those who meet around the bedside of the dying.

We have formulated our message and given it to the world to heed when it will, confident that at last the great Court of International Opinion will pass righteous judgment upon all human affairs.

Condensed Report of Miss Addams' Pilgrimage After the Conference Made by the "Survey"

1. That the women from The Hague actually got through to the men in the state de-

partments of the Great Powers, not merely to drop a tract and be bowed out, but to sit down and talk the issues through. They were not accused anywhere of being "peace-at-any-price" people. Nor was peace their slogan—but some method of approach to a settlement other than the military method which is costing so heavily and is getting nowhere.

2. That these statesmen were for the most part representative of what might be called the civil group in each country; a group which is standing out for victory no less strongly than the military group, but which none the less is apprehensive that under the shadow of the war, long-fought-for civil rights are being invaded; that the longer the war goes on, the less the civil parties will have to say as to its terms of settlement; and that if the military parties of the different nations settle the terms of peace it will mean to clamp militarism upon Europe for a generation.

3. That with the military forces deadlocked along the concrete trenches, the civil leaders would welcome an opportunity to end the war and stay the carnage, but they are themselves bound hand and foot by the feeling that if they even talk terms of peace their position in their own country and before the world will be weak-

ened; that they would welcome, therefore, action by the neutrals which would open a way for negotiation with honor, and that the United States with its mixed peoples is preëminently the country looked to to take the initiative in this emergency.

4. That while offers of mediation by the United States to the belligerents would be rejected, and while no belligerent could ask for mediation, a continuous convention of neutrals would create a channel through which some opportunity might lead to peace; that such a conference should not be made up purely of governmental representatives—who would think and act along rigid nationalistic lines—but should if possible be drawn by some more democratic process from commercial, labor, and scientific fields which have genuine international experience.

Manifesto

Issued by Envoys Sent by the International Congress of Women at the Hague to the Governments of Europe, and the President of the United States.

Here in America, on neutral soil, far removed from the stress of the conflict, we, the envoys to the governments from the International Con-

gress of Women at The Hague, have come together to canvass the results of our missions. We put forth this statement as our united and deliberate conclusions.

At a time when the foreign offices of the great belligerents have been barred to each other, and the public mind of Europe has been fixed on the war offices for leadership, we have gone from capital to capital and conferred with the civil governments.

Our mission was to place before belligerent and neutral alike the resolutions of the International Congress of Women held at The Hague in April; especially to place before them the definite method of a conference of neutral nations as an agency of continuous mediation for the settlement of the war.

To carry out this mission two delegations were appointed which included women of Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United States. One or other of these delegations was received by the governments in fourteen capitals, Berlin, Berne, Budapest, Christiania, Copenhagen, Hague, Havre (Belgian Government), London, Paris, Petrograd, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna and Washington. We were received by the prime ministers and foreign ministers of the Powers, by the

King of Norway, by the presidents of Switzerland and of the United States, by the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary of State. In many capitals more than one audience was given, not merely to present our resolutions but for a thorough discussion. In addition to the thirty-five governmental visits we met—everywhere—members of parliament and other leaders of public opinion.

We heard much the same words spoken in Downing Street as those spoken in Wilhelmstrasse, in Vienna as in Petrograd, in Budapest as in Havre, where the Belgians have their temporary government.

A conference of neutrals

Our visits to the war capitals convinced us that the belligerent governments would not be opposed to a conference of neutral nations; that while the belligerents have rejected offers of mediation by single neutral nations, and while no belligerent could ask for mediation, the creation of a continuous conference of neutral nations might provide the machinery which would lead to peace. We found that the neutrals on the other hand were concerned lest calling such a conference might be considered inopportune by one or other of the belligerents.

Here our information from the belligerents themselves gave assurance that such initiative would not be resented. "My country would not find anything unfriendly in such action by the neutrals," was the assurance given us by the foreign minister of one of the great belligerents. "My government would place no obstacle in the way of its institution," said the minister of an opposing nation. "What are the neutrals waiting for?" said a third, whose name ranks high not only in his own country but all over the world.

It remained to put this clarifying intelligence before the neutral countries and the plan of starting mediation through the agency of a continuous conference of the neutral nations is today being seriously discussed alike in the cabinets of the belligerent and neutral countries of Europe and in the press of both.

Negotiations welcomed

We are in position to quote some of the expressions of men high in the councils of the great nations as to the feasibility of the plan. "You are right," said one minister, "that it would be of the greatest importance to finish the fight by early negotiation rather than by further military efforts, which would result in more

and more destruction and irreparable loss." "Yours is the sanest proposal that has been brought to this office in the last six months," said the prime minister of one of the larger countries.

We were also in position to canvass the objections that have been made to the proposal, testing it out severely in the judgment of those in the midst of the European conflict. It has been argued that it is not the time at present to start such a process of negotiation, and that no step should be taken until one or other party has a victory or at least until some new military balance is struck. The answer we bring is that every delay makes more difficult the beginning of negotiations, more nations become involved and the situation becomes more complicated; that when at times in the course of the war such a balance was struck, the neutrals were unprepared to act. The opportunity passed. For the forces of peace to be unprepared when the hour comes, is as irretrievable as for a military leader to be unready.

Now is the time

It has been argued that for such a conference to be called at any time when one side has met with some military advantage, would be to

favor that side. The answer we bring is that the proposed conference would start mediation at a higher level than that of military advantage. As to the actual military situation, however, we quote a remark made to us by a foreign minister of one of the belligerent powers. "Neither side is to-day strong enough to dictate terms, and neither side is so weakened that it has to accept humiliating terms."

It has been suggested that such a conference would bind the neutral governments coöperating in it. The answer we bring is that as proposed, such a conference should consist of the ablest persons of the neutral countries assigned, not to problems of their own governments, but to the common service of a supreme crisis. The situation calls for a conference cast in a new and larger mold than those of conventional diplomacy, the governments sending to it persons drawn from social, economic and scientific fields who have had genuine international experience.

As women it was possible for us, from belligerent and neutral nations alike, to meet in the midst of war and to carry forward an interchange of question and answer between capitals which were barred to each other. It is now our duty to make articulate our convictions. We have been convinced that the governments of the

belligerent nations would not be hostile to the institution of such a common channel for good offices; and that the governments of European neutrals we visited stand ready to coöperate with others in mediation. Reviewing the situation, we believe that of the five European neutral nations visited, three are ready to join in such a conference, and that two are deliberating the calling of such a conference. Of the intention of the United States we have as yet no evidence.

Growing desire for action

We are but the conveyors of evidence which is a challenge to action by the neutral governments visited—by Denmark, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States. We in turn bear evidence of a rising desire and intention of vast companies of people in the neutral countries to turn a barren disinterestedness into an active good will. In Sweden, for example, more than 400 meetings were held in one day in different parts of the country, calling on the government to act.

The excruciating burden of responsibility for the hopeless continuance of this war no longer rests on the will of the belligerent nations alone. It rests on the will of those neutral governments

and people who have been spared its shock but cannot, if they would absolve themselves from their full share of responsibility for the continuance of war.

Aletta Jacobs,	Holland
Chrystal Macmillan,	Great Britain
Rosika Schwimmer,	Austro-Hungary
Emily G. Balch,	United States
Jane Addams,	United States

CHAPTER II

The Education of the World for a Permanent Peace

BY FANNIE FERN ANDREWS

The civilization of the future depends on the public opinion of to-day. This alone can save for humanity what is left when the present cataclysm has passed by. What men and women think about this war will decide to a great extent the future of the war system. The terror of this catastrophe which should be burnt into our very conscience demands immediate and persistent action by men and women throughout the world. There should be, and there is, a clear, definite course to be taken at this critical moment, and each succeeding moment becomes more and more critical and renders action more and more imperative. There is no sense in the plea that while the war continues we can do nothing. Three distinct questions face us to-day. First, how can the war be stopped? Second, what shall be the terms of

settlement? Third, what plan shall be adopted to prevent future wars? We should try to answer these questions. An informed public opinion should express itself in a definite policy. This is the obvious safe-guard for the future.

How can the war be stopped?

I fully realize how delicate any discussion of this question is and how ill-timed and futile it seems to the great mass of people; but can any one review the past twelve months' carnage and look with indifference on any suggestion or any hope which may break the dead-lock in this ghastly struggle? We are informed by the press that each nation will fight to the finish, and therefore nothing can be done until one side or the other gives in. It is true that the belligerents have refused President Wilson's offer of mediation, although every nation now fighting signed The Hague Convention for Mediation by Neutral Powers; and this policy of non-interference is well-sustained by official utterances from the foreign offices. But is each nation determined to fight to the last man? I must say that my experience in Europe during the months of April and May leads me to believe that this is not an absolute policy. There are some conceivable circumstances which might

lead the nations to accept negotiations for peace. I have not gathered this impression from the European press or from general expressions of opinion. These ideas were brought to me from men and women who analyze thoughts and passions and situations. One striking fact was impressed upon me,—that in all the belligerent countries there are two parties, one the military, which respects nothing but force, and which is determined to crush the enemy at all costs; and the other the international, which deplores the slaughter of human life, and which seeks to conciliate the world through organized justice. The latter sentiment is stronger than one can realize in the face of this world challenge; but it is there, and it is the only hope which the world has for eliminating the sudden outbreak of war.

As J. Ramsay Macdonald says, "That there was a strong peace and international sentiment in Germany alongside the patriotic one I have always believed. Now we are finding that this is so. It ought to be met. It is not responsible for militarism or for military policy. It wishes for peace. By and by it will be able to secure peace—whilst the soldiers are still in the trenches." The soldiers themselves show that international good-will exists in the midst of

this world madness. The number and varied character of the reports coming from the front indicate a common fraternal spirit and a human hesitancy when it comes to the actual point of killing. Dr. Karl Liebknecht, the distinguished German Socialist, declares: "Nowhere have the masses desired this war. Why should they, then, murder each other to finish it? It would be a sign of weakness, it is said, for any one people to suggest peace. Well, let all the people suggest it together. The nation which speaks first will not show weakness, but strength, and will win glory and the gratitude of posterity. Already among the German workers there is far greater opposition to the war than is generally supposed, and the louder the echo of the cry for peace in other countries the more vehemently and energetically will they work for peace here."

Plans for the joint action of neutrals

This international sentiment makes a united appeal in this chaotic time. It condemns the contention of the militarists that the enemy must be crushed. No nation can be crushed; all history proves that a virile people cannot be wiped from the map. This conviction ought to find a ready assent in a generation so advanced

in philosophy, science, economics, and ethics. But the nations can become exhausted, bankrupt; and if this is to be a war of exhaustion, why go to the limit? The plan, put forward by many of the most influential thinkers, for a conference of neutral nations which shall offer continuous mediation as long as the war lasts, presents one method of opening negotiations among the warring nations. Since this plan has been before our Administration for nearly a year, there is undoubtedly some reason why it considers it not feasible. I came home from Europe feeling convinced that some more effective method than this must be devised to bring about peace negotiations. One is very conscious in talking with the citizens of European neutral nations of a well-founded timidity about any official expression of opinion. I got this impression, not only from representative citizens of the neutral countries, but from some of the members of the diplomatic corps at The Hague whose opinions I sought when the resolution, providing for a Conference of Neutral Nations, was brought before the Resolutions Committee of the International Congress of Women. At the moment of this writing, however, the Dutch Anti-War Council, composed of some six hundred Dutch organizations of widely varying in-

terests, is asking the Dutch Government to call a Conference of Neutral Nations.

The resolutions, adopted by the Conference on International Relations at Cornell University last June, sought to secure the coöperation of American republics to deal with the immediate problem of sea-law, which would logically involve an international legislative body and a permanent international court on a small scale. It is obvious that these bodies could expand and be ready to include all nations who later desired to unite with them. It was thought that invitations to other neutral nations at this time might find some of them embarrassed and unable to take strong action.

The suggestion to create an unofficial mediation commission has been endorsed by important observers of international conditions, and if any accurate judgments can be made at all at this time, this commission, if its personnel bore sufficient influence and confidence, might be able to secure information as to the purposes of each government and to transmit them to the others. Certain it is that the need for some definite knowledge as to what the nations are fighting for is of first importance. The Union of Democratic Control is asking the British Government to define the terms upon

which Great Britain is willing to make peace, and demands that these be made known to the Allies and to the enemy. Mr. Arnold Bennett declares that the publication of the terms of peace might prevent an unnecessary continuance of the war. "It would indeed be tragically absurd," says he, "for the fight to continue because both sides were in ignorance of each other's feelings."

So long as the terms of peace are unknown, the military leaders of the two factions are able to incite resistance by representing those terms as so objectionable and disastrous, that sacrifices, however great, and resistance, however prolonged, would be preferable to their acceptance. This is the view expressed by the Union of Democratic Control. "A public pronouncement by the Allies," says this body, "as to the conditions which it is their intention to demand, would deprive the German military leaders of this valuable moral asset."

What shall be the terms of settlement?

From the foregoing, it is obvious that discussion on stopping the war is neither ill-timed nor futile, that in fact this leads very directly to the second great question before us,—what shall be the terms of settlement? Shall they

be made behind the scenes and by the same group of men who made the war? An informed public opinion should express itself on this matter. As the democratic control of foreign policy is in the platform of every organization, meeting during the past year to work out a plan for a permanent peace, the people should insist that this settlement should not be made by a group of diplomats but by men acting under instructions from their parliaments, and they should further insist on their right to know what their parliaments intend to do. This necessitates prolonged study and discussion.

A clear distinction should be made between the form of settlement which would compel a continuation of militarism in every country, and one which will break down militarism and free the world from the fear of another calamity like the present one. People should realize that the kind of settlement made at the close of the war will determine the condition of civilization for generations, and therefore it is necessary to formulate principles which will not defeat the purposes of progressive justice. It is impossible at this time to draft a treaty of peace, but it is possible to stipulate certain principles of action which should be followed. At the peace settlement conference, the principle

should be adopted that no transference of territory shall be made contrary to the wishes and interests of the population, and that no power shall seek its own aggrandizement. The war would end to-day if the public opinion of the world were against aggrandizement and the transference of alien people against their will. In fact, the war would never have started if the peoples had been clear as to the effect of these practices.

How to prevent future wars

With the breaking down of secret diplomacy, by making this peace settlement conference a representative body, responsible to parliaments, the world is prepared for a Conference of the Nations, which shall work out a plan of organization which shall provide for the permanent peace of the world. There can be no complete security for peace until the causes of war are eliminated and a new political organization established. Peace will come only when the peoples of the world recognize the fallacy of the prevailing ideas concerning the relations of governments, and when, with the acquirement of right ideas, the peoples demand a political machinery to make them effective. The determination to secure a permanent peace

among the nations involves a world-wide education of the people in these two directions. They must understand—the common people must understand—how wars are brought about, and they must see the logic and the justice of a world organization, in which the welfare of the people is understood to demand peace rather than war.

Nations versus governments

This is a struggle between peoples and governments, a struggle between democracy and autocracy, and it involves two processes,—the disillusionment of the people themselves, and the forcing of their ideas on those who are in a position to put them into effect. The opinion, that to secure a permanent peace, one nation or the other must be crushed in this war, is a striking phase of the illusion which dominates the world. Each side in the struggle openly claims to be fighting for a durable peace. Under such conditions, is it not imperative that something should be done to eliminate the old ideas which render possible this contradictory spectacle of futile conflict?

The idea has begun to dawn upon the masses, as it has upon many of the thinkers of the world, that the "nations are passive clay in the

hands of their governments." The peace of Europe was in the hands of some twenty individuals. They could make war; and the millions who were to fight and to suffer could not stop it. It is the governments only who are rival units, not the nations; and the machinery of governments has always hampered the labors of the people. "Coöperation between nations," says Norman Angell, "has become essential for the very life of their peoples. But that coöperation does not take place as between States at all." The prevailing notion as to the relation of political power to a nation's prosperity is clearly the chief cause of war, and it is important to recognize this in any plan which purposes to bring about a permanent peace.

A larger conception of patriotism

The great step in world reform depends on making the welfare of the State coincident with the welfare of the people. The world will never be truly civilized until patriotism implies the coöperation of all peoples for their common security and welfare. Until this is so, there can be no true progress in civilization and therefore no free development of peoples. "When love for one's country," says Mr. Crane, "is expressed in hate of another's country, what

was a grand sentiment is twisted into a dangerous delusion." G. Lowes Dickinson says: "A man of science may be a patriot, but his patriotism has nothing to do with his science. He goes to learn where he can learn best, and to work where he can work best; and the result of his work is a treasure not for his country alone but for mankind."

World organization to extend world coöperation is the only plan which will secure a permanent peace, and a world education designed to bring this about should promote a thorough understanding of such an organization. It is as essential for every person to know about the working of international organization in this age of interdependence as it was necessary for every person to comprehend the principles and methods of national politics when nationalism was the highest political ideal. Every nation is deeply concerned in this, for every nation is dependent on other nations, and the prosperity of each is increased as this dependence is increased.

The idea of a League of Peace is the most feasible and practical plan yet advanced to secure the peace of the world. This League contemplates a government which exists for the welfare of the people.

Human solidarity

If the people had ruled the world, there would have been no war. It is even argued that if Europe had remained sane for twenty years longer, such a conflagration as the present could never have broken out; that the international organization among the peoples and the consequent power of order and good-will would have been sufficiently strong to have overcome such a convulsion as this. One writer says that the declaration of war at this time was a crime against humanity for the very reason that good-will had become to be such a distinguishing feature of human society.

The solidarity of human purpose was strikingly illustrated in the International Confidential Meeting at The Hague the first week of last April, when thirty men and women of twelve different countries came together to work out a plan for the permanent peace of the world. International jurists, statesmen and economists, coming from Germany, Belgium, England, Austria, Hungary, meeting with equally distinguished representatives from the neutral nations, almost in the midst of the terrible conflict, present a spectacle which will be valuable in history to illustrate the existence of good-

will in the midst of international anarchy. With a unanimous voice they adopted a "Minimum-Program" which deserves universal consideration.[1]

No stronger word on the solidarity of peoples has been uttered than by Dr. Hans Wehberg, Associate Justice of Düsseldorf, in his letter of resignation as Associate Editor of the German "Journal of International Law," addressed to Privy Councilor Kohler, professor in the University of Berlin. "Never before in history," says Dr. Wehberg, "has the feeling to work together come in such solemn manner to all those who earnestly desire the agreement of peoples. Representatives of international law in all cases ought especially to draw nearer together, because of the recent events more than ever before, to promote the ideals that seemed in danger of breaking down. Although Professor Oppenheim's connection with our 'Journal' has been very informal, yet the erasure of his name at this moment is a matter of most peculiar significance. It would seem to demonstrate that the bond connecting German and English scholars is destroyed—a matter to which I cannot become a party. On the contrary, I point emphatically to the ideal that in questions of in-

[1] See Appendix IV.

ternational law there are no hostile nations, but rather a shoulder-to-shoulder fight, where all strive for the same ends."

International Congress of Women

The meeting of the International Congress of Women, convened two weeks after the International Confidential Meeting at The Hague, is peculiarly important as showing that the good-will which had always characterized the international gatherings of women could be sustained in the face of a threatened collapse of civilization. The women who initiated the Congress were firm in their conviction of the solidarity of women; they reasoned that those who had been meeting together year after year to discuss measures contributing to the welfare of human beings could decide on some unanimous action concerning this world catastrophe. The central idea in this international gathering, shared equally by the representatives of the belligerent and neutral nations, voiced the cry that this catastrophe must never be repeated; that this must be the last war; that human wisdom and foresight must devise practical means of ridding this agitated world of legalized, wholesale human slaughter; that the keenest intelligence of all countries should concentrate

itself on the solution of this world problem.

After accepting the strongest condemnation of the war system ever uttered by an international group, and protesting as never before against the "odious wrongs of which women are the victims in time of war," the Congress, representing twelve countries, seven of which were belligerent, laid down with a technical intelligence, which challenges that of the meeting of experts held at The Hague a week previous, principles of a permanent peace.[1]

The duty of the United States

Any plan which has in view the education of the world for a permanent peace must consider the human reconstruction which is sure to follow the war. An iron law will compel those now engaged in mutual destruction to seek one another again. The day will come when the peoples of the world will work once more in common. This reconstruction will not be the task of any one nation, of any one people. The world will face it together. It may be that our country will assist in shaping events which will lay the foundations for a higher civilization. The United States must play its part. The development of the American ideal is de-

[1] See summary of resolutions, Appendix III.

pendent on the way in which this country reacts on the military, economic and moral condition of the world. The new citizenship demands a knowledge of the elements which advance or retard the general betterment of mankind. The upheavals in Europe have already affected our conception of future ideals, and have thrust upon us a responsibility for civilization which we must inevitably assume. If civilization breaks down in Europe, we shall suffer just as vitally, although not so directly, as Germany, Great Britain or France. The unique position of the United States, however, gives her the leadership in establishing a new form of world society which will lay the foundations of a higher world life. Every citizen of our country should be conscious of this new obligation and should understand the method by which the United States may render this service to the world, and in so doing protect herself in the free development of her national ideal. To the United States belongs the responsibility of organizing this world league of peace, and each and every citizen should assist in creating this new organ of human society, whereby human justice may have full sway.

CHAPTER III

The Immediate Duty of American Patriots

BY LUCIA AMES MEAD

The European war probably marks the most critical period in human history. Civilization has come to a great turning point and faces two alternatives. One is renewed reliance on force; conscription extending gradually to America and the Orient; an armed Asia facing an armed Europe; decreasing democracy; repudiation of intolerable war debts and the decay of all that makes life worth living. The other alternative is initial steps through a League of Peace toward world organization and a beginning of that coöperation which can alone preserve nations from even a worse catastrophe than that which this tragic year has wrought.

Amid the maddening maze of things, in which many trained minds have lost their bearings, a few points stand out clearly to those who have not been led into the quagmire of sophistry

that is so largely responsible for the great war. These permanent principles can not be understood unless one perceives the causes of the European war.

Causes of the war

This war was due largely to false premises, confused thinking, wrong analogies and twisted logic. These, through the teaching of chauvinistic patriotism and crude economics from primary school through university, led in many lands to a philosophy that bred national arrogance, and fear. Fear clamored for armaments, blind to the fact that these bred rival armaments or that there was any other defense of life or honor but explosives.

This war was precipitated by men of twentieth century education in technique combined with seventeenth century conceptions of honor and international relations. It was largely the slow product of primary text book writers, of Harmsworth newspapers, of learned Teutonic professors and materialistic philosophers. It was fomented by parliamentarians who pocketed dividends from the dreadnoughts that they ordered, ministers of foreign affairs who had never met; diplomats separated from the people by a great gulf of indifference and misunder-

standing and by bishops and clergy who taught a double standard of ethics, one for the individual and one for the nations. It was a war brought on by ultimatums which, with a censored press, paralyzed the great financial and labor forces that would have prevented it had even a month's delay offered opportunity. For more than a generation subtle forces had been working in many lands which bound hand and foot all protesters when the great exigency arose.

Sophistry

The same subtle forces are working here and now, undermining American ideals with smug complacency, self-righteousness and certainty that *we* can never be militarized. Our Army and Navy League have glorified Prussian methods and held them up for imitation. Our most eminent general asserted two years ago that he would like to "out German the Germans" in military training and teach every boy of twelve to shoot. These men are now in the saddle, urging that war is inevitable and night and day pushing their demands for enormous increase of armaments with the same arguments that brought about Europe's preparedness for the great calamity. At this critical

moment when the world's opinion is in flux and America can help shape it, the first public duty of the patriot is to think logically and remember that the greatest forces are not reeking tubes or iron shards. This is more difficult than feeding starving Serbians, but it may in the end save more lives.

Before long, ideas will crystallize and crude thought and prejudice are quite as likely as insight and reason to harden into an adamantine mold. Our country is the blessed land of opportunity. It is the only one of the eight powers not in the agonizing grip of war. It can think. Its supreme business is to think and to help others to think. The patriot's first task is to learn to read the daily press so as to detect sophistry from sagacity and to perceive relative values; above all things to count nothing human, foreign, and to see the world through alien's eyes. The common fallacies which occur in myriad phraseologies, must be learned by heart, together with their refutation. Space forbids analysis of but a few.

Military advisers

One dangerous error is that military men should be our chief advisers concerning national dangers and the most adequate forms of de-

fense. Thirty years study of war-games and the qualities of projectiles teaches no one the psychologic processes of foreign cabinets and the influences that would most antagonize or win them. It may prove in the future that paying back Chinese indemnities, making friends with Cuba, repealing the exemption of Panama canal tolls and employing mediation of "A B C" powers have helped defend us from more enemies than has all our fleet. The brave military man whose patriotism and skill are not questioned is admirable as a technician, but not as a statesman. His constant insistence that "all government depends on force" ignores the fact that armies and navies themselves could not exist without agriculture, manufactures, commerce, money, and railroads which with the tacit consent of the governed, with schools, the courts, the press and other necessities form the broad basis on which government *rests*. Force is *used* by all nations, but it is used the least in the most stable government and only in such countries as Turkey or Mexico is it a prominent factor in maintaining government.

War and struggle

"War," in the words of Gen. Wood, "is inevitable because life is an eternal struggle."

Struggle, to be sure, is the law of the universe, but it is tragic confusion of thought which confounds that brief, abnormal kind of struggle, called "war," with the wholesome, eternal struggle against conditions in which man gains life more abundantly. It is assumed that war exists in the animal world and is our natural inheritance. An American general has just said, "We are animals and every man who feels as a man should glories in being a buck in the outer ring when danger threatens his country. A young man who hasn't some fighting instinct is denatured and a mollycoddle. In the last analysis our civilization depends on the sword." Here is a mature, brave man who has not learned what ought to be taught to every schoolboy before he is old enough to do long division. This is that war to-day is no more inevitable than are duels; no more natural than are murders. When brutes kill, it is almost always other species and for food. The wolf who kills a lamb is no more engaged in war than is the farmer who does the same thing for the same purpose—food. A pack of wolves never attacks another pack of wolves, but organized men, through perversion of nature, attack their own kind—their natural colleagues.

Man follows scientifically the law of his own being when he, like Peary, contends against Arctic frosts, or, like Livingstone, against tropical fever, or, like Jacob Riis, fights slums and civic corruption or, like many a rheumatic heroine at the washtub, struggles for her children's bread and education. But he sets at nought all science and the laws of his true being when he permits himself to destroy his co-laborers in the eternal struggle against nature and moral evil. Only by coöperation has man advanced from the half-starved savage to the command of all climes and countries for the furnishing of his breakfast table, and the spiritual enrichment of all life. Had it not been for the world's innumerable wars, destroying untold numbers of mute, inglorious Edisons, Pasteurs and Adam Smiths, countless Gutenbergs, Darwins, Newtons and Washingtons, man's united struggle against environment might have practically abolished disease, poverty and crime.

Those who put their faith in explosives to secure justice assume that pacifists are bloodless, flabby and afraid to fight because they "lack physical courage." They logically put Benjamin Franklin, Kant, Victor Hugo, Cobden, Bright, and Charles Sumner in the category of anæmic invalids. The red-blooded op-

ponent of their sophistry who is toiling night and day to spread clear ideas proudly declares, "I was ever a fighter"; but he believes in struggle that is constructive and he knows that war—"collective homicide"—is no more inevitable than slavery.

Kinds of war

Col. Roosevelt divides wars into "just" and "unjust" wars. Are they not rather to be divided into civil and international? Among these our Revolution is to be classed as a civil war, fought between the progressive and retrogressive parties on both sides the Atlantic. Most past wars occurred before present substitutes for war were available and were generally less inexcusable than present wars. Civil war can not yet be prepared for, or prevented, or stopped in the same ways as international war and to that extent is differentiated from it. How nations are to deal with domestic war is an immediate problem in this hemisphere.

Civilized nations can not indefinitely tolerate anarchy in a neighbor State whose starving people cry for help. Military interference by any strong neighbor alone brings the same difficulties that would follow if a respectable citi-

zen should undertake to chastise a turbulent family next door whose screams annoyed the neighborhood and whose habits were offensive. The quarreling members would at once unite against him and his neighbors would be suspicious that he would, in turn, exercise authority against them. He would find his interference did not permanently settle anything and that he had aroused prolonged bitterness. No citizen presumes thus to interfere, but he is not helpless to correct an obvious wrong. He goes to the town meeting and the collective authority of the town through sheriff, truant officer and health board accomplishes a salutary compulsion which may last and, at all events, arouses no reprisals. Were an American republic, torn by anarchy, to be denied the sinews of war by the united action of the Pan-American Union it must yield. Such compulsion could arouse no permanent bitterness, as it is evident none would gain advantage and all would act for the good of the country rent by strife. Revolution or rebellion may occur indefinitely wherever there are tyranny or violent dissensions. It will be the last form of war to cease absolutely; but when international war is at an end, there will be few factions in a nation so disturb-

ing as to call for interference by the organized family of nations.

Present or future international wars is the main problem, and none can ever be "just." No war can be more than half righteous for, if one side has a just case, the other has not. Those who talk of "just wars" ignore the fact that there must be two parties to a conflict as much as two in a marriage. If only one side fights, it is a massacre, not war. Benjamin Franklin's dictum that "there never was a good war," was based on the recognition of the fact that a war only half-good is not good, any more than a marriage in which one party to it is unfaithful is a good marriage or a half-decayed peach is a good peach. In modern war every nation claims that it is simply defending itself, and therefore says its cause is just, itself being the sole judge.

Rival and non-rival forces

That armies and navies are national police and will be needed as long as cities need police to deal with thieves and assassins, is a fallacy that has cost the world incalculable sums for armaments. It appears almost daily in the press or pulpit. It deludes the orderly citizen

into the belief that any opponent of an "adequate" navy is a fanatic and would curtail instruments of justice. No error is more common or dangerous. *Justice is the primary consideration; but this can not be achieved by settling questions of boundary line, or honor, or anything else by machine guns.* Armies and navies are simply the tools of nations which have prepared for international dueling. Whatever degree of justice they achieve is accidental, incidental and accompanied with a long train of injustices to the innocent. They let a nation be judge, jury and executioner in its own case and they use the maximum of power to destroy.

Police on the contrary, preserve and protect. As Dr. Charles W. Eliot has well said, their function is far higher than that of the soldier. They use the minimum of force to get a man before a court of justice. They never punish a criminal but simply carry him before a judge and jury where he may defend his case. Police, unlike navies are not rival bodies. The police of one city never fight the police of another city; the militia, likewise, never fight the militia of another State. What analogy have these non-rival preservers of order and justice to the rival millions that are hurling tons of projectiles at each other?

Some day the world will have an International Police. This like a real police, will primarily perform helpful service in time of flood and earthquake and it will protect the seas in a world that will have no armies and navies left to compete with it. In the transition period, when no nation will disarm until disarmament is general, at least let no misleading euphemism of "police" be applied to our fleet, however much it may apply to our little army.

National dangers

Like all patriots, world-organizers, commonly called "pacifists," are believers in national defense. But they maintain that armaments and defense are not synonymous. They demand real defense for real dangers. Two kinds of dangers threaten our country: those that enormously destroy life and property in preventable and not very noticeable ways, and those that might possibly come and in very spectacular ways accomplish what has never been threatened before. One danger is very terrible and certain: the other, purely hypothetical. The American people to-day are a thousand times more excited about the remotely possible, than about the awfully certain dangers. A thousand people thrill with horror at the slaughter of one

hundred Americans by a torpedo, not fired purposely upon Americans as such, to one who is aghast at the loss of over 600,000 citizens every year from preventable disease and accident. This is about the number lost by bullets and disease on both sides in our Civil War. One fact appeals even to the untrained imagination; the other vastly more appalling fact appeals about as much to the average citizen as to the kindergarten child. Logic plays little part in suiting national defense to danger.

National defense

At this moment when wild fancy and timidity threaten to control the action of voters and taxpayers, certain simple facts should be religiously considered. Since Washington's day, when our area has increased about four times, our population about twenty-five times, our expenditure for war preparations has increased over two hundred and fifty times, and we are spending two dollars out of three in our treasury for past and future war.

We have a navy which ranks third and may prove to be the second when the war ends. When alarmists shriek that we are "defenseless," a credulous public forgets that we are in many ways the best defended people in the

world, even if one assumes that these hypothetical dangers are real.

We are the only country in the world that is protected by two great oceans. We are the only country in the world that has one great, impregnable borderline which will remain secure so long as it is unfortified. We are the richest country in the world and have shown amazing capacity of late to create speedily the sinews of war. We have never been attacked even when for many decades we were practically without a navy. We began all our three foreign wars since we became a republic and all of these were avoidable. So long as we do not aim to equal England's navy, it is our asset. Should we become obsessed by the monstrous notion that we "must prepare to fight the victor, whoever it prove to be," we should throw away our enormous defense in our unguarded Canadian border. Our treaties with thirty nations which pledge investigation and a year's delay before hostilities are important elements of defense. We stand in a unique category, our non-military defenses being greater than those of any nation; they cost no annual appropriation and are more potent than a great, standing army. These can easily be enormously increased.

Futility of increased war preparations at present

Should we yield to the sophistry that would push us into still larger armaments before this war has ended, we should not learn the military lessons of the war and know what armaments would be most effective. But what is of vastly greater consequence, we should arouse suspicion, lose our moral leadership, and be far less effective in asking for proportionate reduction when the war ends. All belligerents are certain to be exhausted, and incapable of further war for years to come. Japan is frightfully overtaxed and her interests are all in Asia.

A conceivably victorious Germany is pictured in the lurid columns of the jingo press as able to reduce us to humiliation if we do not vote away $500,000,000 of the people's taxes in war preparations. But they do not tell us how a nation of 65,000,000 men, women and children could venture to leave their borders unguarded, and let a horde of revengeful foes, numbering four times their number, over-run their land if they shipped army and navy three thousand miles over sea. They forget that no conqueror can hold down Belgium and acquired African colonies without men. These men will be all

insufficient for that enormous task. Starvation and revolution are yet to do their work ere we can look for any possible attack from Europe. The terror which has been inspired by what has been done in Belgium has grotesquely warped the minds of millions here who ignore world-wide differences of conditions, the power of concerted economic compulsion, physical possibilities and the great, new form of defense that a League of Peace can supply without extra cost.

No nation can to-day stand adequately armed against possible dangers, for this means facing a coalition. For us it would be coalitions both on the Atlantic and the Pacific. The wildest demands of the scaremongers are inadequate to equal what we shall need if we are to face a world which would count the huge armaments demanded as a menace. After every sacrifice, we should still fail to tax ourselves enough. Why try to renew the old-world method that has set at nought all the militarists' prophecies of armaments proving "an insurance"? New defenses must largely replace armaments in the future if civilization is not to perish from the earth.

Non-intercourse

The power of concerted non-intercourse [1] as a compulsive force has had scant consideration. When non-intercourse is mentioned, the average man makes some cheap witticism about Jefferson's embargo or some sporadic industrial boycott, and tells you that a submarine is the kind of defense that he is going to rely on. But submarines and 16-inch guns are not defending Europe from ruin. They are daily hastening it. Is it not time, in this crisis, when a league of peace has seemed to statesmen the only possible solution for present international anarchy, that its chief weapon of coercion, when it is complete, be carefully considered? No league of peace can be such if each member retains its old, menacing armies and navies. As fast as one nation after another elects to enter the league and adds its quota of force to the combined forces of the league, the sum total of these can and should proportionately diminish. When the last one of the eight great powers which own nine-tenths of the armaments of the world joins the league, their joint military defense can diminish to mere militia and a small international police.

[1] See note on page 120 of the Appendix.

Before this is wholly achieved, even from the outset, when perhaps only three or four nations combine, the use at first of economic pressure and, finally, of complete non-intercourse can be made very effective. Let this principle once be embodied in international law and let non-intercourse be known as the penalty to be inflicted by neutrals whenever a nation refuses delay, investigation and arbitration before forcing an opponent into war, and it would go far toward calling a halt. Non-intercourse, unlike armaments, costs nothing for its upkeep when not in use.

The close interdependence of nations makes the cutting off of railroad, shipping and telegraphic connection of far more vital consequence than in former days. It would need to be applied rarely, if ever. Let a league of peace resolutely carry out such a pledge and make any nation that had broken faith or was belligerent anathema and excommunicate from the family of nations, and it would go far to force such a nation to yield and, in self-defense, to join the league of peace, and be defended, in turn, against aggression from without.

Even sporadic, temporary and unofficial non-intercourse has often been somewhat effective. The Japanese as well as American cotton mer-

chants suffered seriously some years ago from the boycott of Chinese merchants. But a concerted boycott based on recognized international agreement would be such a power as the world has not yet seen.

CHAPTER IV

Organized War on War, and Some Popular Misconceptions

BY ROSE DABNEY FORBES (MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES)

"Do you really believe Peace Societies have ever accomplished much of anything?" This is frequently asked of those who are laboring for the cause of permanent international peace. Sometimes the interrogator would like to be sympathetic but more often, having been surrounded by shallow notions of the anti-war work, the question is asked in a thinly veiled spirit of sarcasm.

The Peace Movement is a determined onslaught on the barbarous system of war, and a persistent pointing of the way to constructive international relations. It is still imperfectly understood even by persons who are distinctly in accord with its fundamental object. Because they have read a number of articles on international peace there are individuals who think they know all there is to know, but they

have not in truth sufficient knowledge to gauge the movement itself or to interpret aright the chapter which is now being unfolded. As for the antagonistic critic, no matter how slight may have been his acquaintance, he is sure, perhaps because the name sounds simple, that he understands, and he talks glibly of the inadequacy of peace organizations. He declares, "Wars are still fought and many people even yet believe in war; ergo: The Peace Societies have done nothing." This is as logical as to have said in Utah a few years ago, "Christianity is a failure because the system of polygamy still exists."

Why should it be difficult to gauge the Peace Movement? If its agencies have accomplished much, should it not be easy for every one to recognize this at a glance? The briefest, yet the most comprehensive answer is that *great permeating influences cannot be measured in concrete terms.* One cannot estimate the growth of any moral reform by tons or miles, and most persons find it difficult to grasp progress or power except through statistics.

One should study this movement as he would any other great human development; he must know its history and its achievements, as well as its aims.

One reason for misconception

There is a psychological, though unrecognized, reason for the lack of comprehension, in that the name, "Peace," has been used as a title both for the cause of peace and for the instrumentalities organized to do its work. This has wrought infinite misunderstanding and even prejudice. The word "peace," one of the most beautiful in the vocabulary of the human race, stands for the *result* of *righteousness;* peace is an effect, not a working force.

Only in a restricted sense of the word is peace simply a cessation of war, and it is confusing to have had the name given to organizations which are undertaking the bold and arduous work of overthrowing an old and brutal system. Had Peace Societies long since been christened with a truly descriptive name their influence would have spread infinitely more rapidly; instead of having to be explained, the title would have carried its own translation. When a man new to the propaganda hears the words, "Peace Society," "peace advocate," and "pacificist," he not unnaturally associates passive and mild attributes with the movement which they represent; he thinks he "would almost be ashamed to join a Peace Society," for, he says, he does

"not believe that men are intended to live without fighting!" Then the explanation has to be made that the "fighting" he means, viz.: healthy struggle and competition, is not synonymous with the killing of human beings, and that the peace work *is a fight.* A few of the societies have tried to keep free of this hindrance to their progress by adopting such names as "The International Polity Clubs," "Corda Fratres," "The Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes," etc. Is it too late for a prize to be offered for the best title for anti-war organizations, keeping the word "Peace" only for the great cause itself?

Unseen influences

For many years, through varied methods of teachings the public mind has been influenced, but the average man of to-day knows not whence comes his point of view on war and peace. If determined groups of men and women had not long been working to give the new ideas to the multitude, the majority even in our own country would still be thinking and saying, as the majority still says in older countries: "War is necessary—war has always been the way for nations to settle disputes and always will be;

and, besides, war is the nursery of heroism and nations without wars degenerate."

The answers to such old-fashioned assertions are fast getting to be on every one's tongue. Many a man would now be able to reply in the words of George Washington:

"My first wish is to see this plague to mankind [war] banished from the earth."

Or after the manner of Thomas Jefferson:

"I do not believe war the most certain means of enforcing principles. . . . I abhor war and view it as the greatest scourge of mankind."

Most Americans now perceive Emerson's wisdom when he wrote:[1]

"War to sane men at the present day begins to look like an epidemic insanity. . . . The sympathy with war is a juvenile and temporary state. . . . It is not a great matter how long men refuse to believe the advent of peace; a universal peace is as sure as is the prevalence of civilization over barbarism, of liberal governments over feudal forms. The question for us is only *How soon?* . . . The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. . . . If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, namely, the will to carry their life in their hand, and stake it at any instant for principle, but have gone one step beyond the hero and will not seek another man's life."

[1] Essay on War, by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Largely because of the word "peace," persons not yet understanding the movement imagine that those who are trying to bring about the new order are making use merely of appeals to sentiment, talking in gentle tones of how to bring the millennium, and crying, "Peace! Peace"; whereas, the truth is that the war against war is an aggressive campaign of education, its teachings expounded in no mincing or uncertain tones. The anti-war worker deals not in doves nor olive branches; and he must needs stand firm in his faith, not heeding either the ridicule or the sneers of the unconverted.

In this brief chapter there is time simply to indicate the development and to mention a few historic facts. The promulgation of the fundamental doctrines—the abolition of the system of war, and the inauguration of a federated world, with an international parliament and an international court, backed by an international police force, has gone forward by leaps and bounds in the last two decades; but the sowing of the seed had gone on for centuries before.

Early history

Since remote days the world has had her prophets of peace and we find among early Greek writers some of the most powerful ar-

raignments of war. Isaiah and Micah, with their glorious visions, were peace prophets in Israel; and nineteen hundred years ago was born in Bethlehem the Prince of Peace, whose words are even yet little understood.

During the first two centuries after Christ, his followers refused to fight at all; then the church temporarily yielded to love of pomp and power, war was apotheosized instead of condemned, and the vision of the faithful was dimmed.

In the fourteenth century was born in the city of Coutances, Pierre Du Bois, who issued a plan for an international, representative organization which, strange to say, was practically followed six hundred years later when the first Hague Conference met in 1899; though probably few individuals present had ever heard of this French lawyer.

In Shakespeare's day, Henry IV of France published "The Great Design," which proposed European federation and was the first comprehensive scheme in modern history to organize the nations, but Ravaillac's dagger frustrated the attempt to carry into effect the mighty project.

Hugo Grotius, Holland's greatest scholar, gave to the world, in the beginning of the sev-

enteenth century, an epoch-making book, of which Andrew D. White wrote:

"Of all works not claiming to be inspired, 'The Rights of War and Peace' has proven the greatest blessing to humanity."

In England a few years later, George Fox with his followers endured beatings and persecution for standing steadfast to their faith. They were called "Quakers" because they made the enemies of peace to quake by their burning words against war. William Penn in the same century not only kept peace with the Indians, but he published "The Present and Future Peace of Europe," which provided for a Congress of Nations.

A hundred years later, Emmanuel Kant, the master mind of Germany, developed the idea that international peace can never be permanently attained until the world is organized.

In the years following our Declaration of Independence the prophets came in greater numbers. The "Father of our Country," soldier though he was, spoke against war in no uncertain terms; then, followed denunciations of the system from Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Josiah Quincy, David Low Dodge, William Ladd, Elihu Burritt, Noah

Worcester, William Ellery Channing, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Lloyd Garrison, Charles Sumner, Edward Everett Hale, and many others of our nineteenth century thinkers. In Europe, Cobden, Bright and Victor Hugo were courageous champions of the new ideals. Gladstone's stand on the peace question made possible, after our Civil War, the arbitration of the Alabama Claims which involved questions of vital interest and honor.

Perhaps no book, except "Rights of War and Peace," has rendered more practical service to the cause than "The Future of War," the work of a Polish Jew—Jean de Bloch. This book in 1897 startled the serious thinkers in Europe and was one of the cardinal forces that brought about the first Hague Conference. Since de Bloch's book, no other has had such widespread influence as Norman Angell's "The Great Illusion," already published in over twenty languages.

Organizations

In the last one hundred years, peace societies have multiplied enormously, not only here in America, but all over the world, so that there are now many hundreds of separate organizations, with scores of branches.

Among the foremost international organizations are: (a) The International Peace Bureau at Berne, which arranges regular international congresses; (b) The Interparliamentary Union, with over 2500 members of past and present parliaments, which meets regularly in various capitals; (c) The Corda Fratres, composed of university students of different lands and (d) The Federation of International Polity Clubs in the American universities.

The most important American endowments for propaganda are, in order of their establishment: (a) "The World Peace Foundation," founded by Edwin Ginn in 1910, which has circulated more books and pamphlets than any organization in the world, and promotes work in schools, colleges and the press; (b) "The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace," which operates in many fields through its three departments—law, economics and education; (c) "The Church Peace Union," which supplies religious and other associations with an immense amount of information and stimulus.

The most far-reaching membership societies are: (a) The American Peace Society, founded in 1828, with thirty state branches; (b) The American School Peace League, established in 1908 which is doing remarkable work through

its forty-three state branches;[1] (c) "The Woman's Peace Party" formed in Washington, D. C., in January, 1915, which has already twenty-six state branches with some thousands of women in its ranks.

The "Women's Christian Peace Society" is steadily growing, and there are other effective bodies which space forbids enumerating. Some large associations have added the peace cause to the other reforms for which they are working; among these are labor organizations, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the National Grange, the Socialist Party and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The Hague Conferences

Though their significance is little appreciated as yet by the general public, the two Hague Conferences are the most striking evidence of the advance already made toward international

[1] The League has published a "Course in Citizenship" besides valuable peace material for schools. It aims not to burden full curricula with a new subject, but to help teachers to present geography, history, economics, civics and patriotism from the viewpoint of twentieth century needs. Not only does it work in close coöperation with our National Education Association, but its influence has spread to Europe. When sufficiently endowed the League will become the great medium for shaping the thought of future generations throughout the world.

peace. The ignorance which prevails in regard to this momentous chapter of history is astounding.

In 1898 the world was amazed by a letter sent by the Czar of Russia to the twenty-six governments represented at his Court.[1]

His rescript called for a discussion of international problems, especially the subject of the increasing burden of armaments.

Holland, being a small independent country, was chosen as the meeting place, and the Conference opened on May 18th at The Hague. One hundred delegates with fifty attachés assembled, among whom were some of the most distinguished diplomats of the world. Hon. Andrew D. White, our ambassador to Berlin, who headed the American delegation, with Lord Pauncefote, who headed the British delegation,

[1] In view of the appalling verification of the forecast of this document, some passages deserve quotation: "Nations' labor and capital are for the major part diverted from their natural application and unproductively consumed. Hundreds of millions are devoted to acquiring terrible engines of destruction, which, though to-day regarded as the last work of science, are destined to-morrow to lose all value in consequence of some fresh discovery in the same field. National culture, economic progress and the production of wealth are either paralyzed or checked;—it appears then that if this state of things is prolonged it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert and the horrors of which make every human being shudder in advance."

were successful in banishing the atmosphere of pessimism which at first prevailed. Like the statesmen who met in Independence Hall in 1787 to frame our Constitution and who at times feared that nothing they attempted would succeed, these men at the outset were downcast, but presently found themselves working hard on three committees in Queen Wilhelmina's little palace, "The House in the Wood." No visitors or reporters were admitted. The Baroness von Suttner, William T. Stead and other noted peace workers lent their influence. Jean de Bloch presented every member with his six-volume work, "The Future of War," and gave luminous addresses in the evenings.[1]

At one stage, the unwillingness of a great European power to coöperate, very nearly frustrated all progress. At this juncture, Ambassador White sent to Berlin a New York lawyer from our delegation, who showed by multitudes of letters and telegrams the interest of Americans in the Conference. This produced a decided effect; obstacles were removed and the work went on.

[1] Interesting reminiscences of those momentous days are found in Baroness von Suttner's autobiography and in Andrew D. White's "The First Hague Conference."

This first Conference provided for *Mediation,* and *Commissions of Inquiry* before hostilities, and established a Permanent International Tribunal which had been the aim of American peace workers for sixty years. In two months as much had been accomplished toward world organization as in all previous history.

The Tribunal opened in April, 1901. In much less time than it took our Supreme Court to receive its first case, the United States and Mexico set the wheels in motion by sending to it a long outstanding case, which was satisfactorily settled within a month. Since then, all the great nations have submitted cases to it, and now the Peace Palace given by Mr. Carnegie adds dignity to its deliberations. The Tribunal is open when disputants choose to use it and a panel of judges, composed of eminent jurists from many countries is drawn on for the five members who settle each case.

During the Russo-Japanese War, when the Russian fleet, warned to beware of Japanese torpedo boats, was plowing through the North Sea one afternoon at twilight, it fired on some English fishing boats and hurried on without investigation. The fury in England over this "Doggerbank incident" was intense and the war spirit gained ground instantly. But, ac-

cording to the proposal at The Hague Conference as to the use of Commissions of Inquiry, the whole matter was referred to five admirals, chosen from different countries who sat in Paris and heard the testimony. The attack was found to be not malicious but a blunder, and Russia voluntarily paid $300,000 to the widows and orphans of the fishermen.

When President Roosevelt invited the Russians and Japanese to Portsmouth to consider ending their war, he did it by the provision of Mediation made at The Hague.

In six years one war was prevented, one war ended and several disputes settled.

The Second Hague Conference, held in 1907, included representatives of forty-four nations. This provided for a Court of Arbitral Justice to settle questions not by arbitration but by law, which was to supplement the Arbitration Tribunal of 1899. As no agreement was made as to how the fifteen judges were to be selected this Court has not yet been established. One of the important decisions of the Second Conference was the calling of a Third Conference, which undoubtedly indicates periodic world conferences.

The Hague Conferences came into existence, not simply because the Czar sent out his re-

script, but because of the intellectual development which preceded; compelling moral forces had been in operation in Russia as in other lands.

The tragic folly of the nations in failing to use more fully and to develop further the work so well begun is chiefly due to that reliance on force which the war-traders and jingo press have fostered.

The spread of peace ideals

When one realizes that the growth of the Peace Movement is due to the definite work of societies and of individuals, one begins to see that instead of "little has been accomplished by the Peace Societies," almost *everything* has been accomplished by them in bringing about the present ideals of peace. "But," the still unbelieving man exclaims, "you don't attribute to Peace workers all the change in public sentiment on these questions, do you? Of course, general advance in thought and the teaching of the religious organizations have brought the change." The questioner argues without full knowledge, for the Christian, the Mohammedan and other churches have for the most part upheld and even glorified war, and not until bodies

of workers began to wage war on the system did many churches catch the vision. The same slowness has been demonstrated in their grasping the new attitude on this question as was evinced on the slavery question seventy years ago when the anti-slavery men and women were at work and had to convert many of their clergy to the point of view that the system of slavery should be abolished from the face of the earth.

At the outbreak of Europe's present terrific conflict, indignation against the war system came out with unmistakable emphasis, not only here but in European countries, and has been growing every day. Large numbers of men and women all over the world when allowed to express an opinion, are saying, "War is an anachronism in our day and generation. This war must end all wars between civilized peoples."

The Peace Movement is the Crusade of our day!

Is it not the duty of every person who believes in the principles to join at least one of the organizations working to spread them? In unity is strength, and if the peace army can have full membership, the system of war cannot endure a day.

Isolated indeed from the main currents of

civilization is the man or woman who stands aloof; who does not in some way help on this holy Crusade of the twentieth century, the Crusade for Justice and Brotherhood.

CHAPTER V

Some Aspects of the Economics of War

BY DENYS P. MYERS

The European war began, it is generally asserted, as the result of keen commercial rivalries and the effort to maintain or to secure a place in the sunlight of international commerce. As soon as the war began, international commerce practically went out of existence, and even the inflated demands of the belligerents for munitions failed to keep it at anywhere near its former volume. War is thus proving the very murderer of the thing it is alleged to be fought for. Obviously, there is something wrong in the primary assumption that war can help trade.

The truth is that if the European war really did begin as a result of commercial rivalries, it had a beginning based on theories that are illusory. The argument is that nations are trade rivals, that they must have colonial markets or they will not be world powers, and that the sole alternatives confronting a modern

state are "world power or downfall." In these propositions the only truth is that a good many persons in high place believed them, and the people naturally took mental color from their leaders. Where these illusory economic doctrines were not believed, leaders could not do otherwise than act according to them, because they were opposed by nations that held these views. The supposed need of expansion of a rapidly growing population like that of Germany in which 65,000,000 people live in an area less than that of Texas, is refuted by the fact that, since Germany became industrial and commercial, her emigration has decreased from 250,000 a year to about 30,000 and her immigrants are three to one of her emigrants.

The nation's real business

Are nations trade rivals? Not unless they think they are. The real business of a nation, is to ensure, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In other words, the fundamental purposes of a nation are all purposes to be realized within its own boundaries. It is not the size of a country but the level of the general welfare that constitutes national success. The general welfare is normally a people's primary

aim. A nation ought to care for itself first, and after that to enter international commerce; for all exports and imports should be surpluses in the country where they originated.

But exportation implies persuading people to buy. Persons who advocate war to advance trade fail to consider that people buy the goods which suit them best. Quality, price and satisfactory delivery count far more than who made the article. It is not the flag under which one claims protection, but the goods themselves that make their market.

Our world interdependent

There is a great body of exceptions to this rule of international trade, but they also refute the idea that nations are trade rivals. In the pursuit of happiness, civilization has advanced so that the products of any area no longer suffice for its maintenance and comfort. The world has become interdependent and at our very breakfast table each of us lays the world under tribute. Fruit from California or Florida, cereal from the Middle West or Canada, a steak perhaps from the Argentine, coffee from Arabia or Brazil, all eaten off china from France reflect the commerce of the world. But, take note, the things that we draw from abroad

to make our comfort or even to keep body and soul together, are things we ourselves do not sufficiently supply and which we might not have if they did not come to us in international commerce. We depend upon them to widen the horizons of our lives much more than foreign merchants depend upon us for their profits.

This increasing interdependence has changed the whole trend of the world. We have left a century behind the days when a country could live to itself so completely that "strange air made a man unfree," a slave, and when, if he died abroad, all his property was confiscated by the community where he expired. Now no nation can permanently live to itself alone, and in normal times none tries to. The bulk of international commerce is in the products which are the peculiar produce of restricted areas. The world's stock of gold comes from three or four small districts but, unless every country possesses some of it, no financial system could exist.

What a nation's trade is

Unless there were an international financial system, no extensive international commerce could exist. Its existence and operation emphasize the truth that it is not nations that are

trade rivals. In countries of the same order of civilization it is those engaged in the same business who are rivals, but they stand or fall together. "National" trade has been well illustrated by Normal Angell in his Essen ironmaster building a light railroad for Argentina with capital subscribed in Paris because French wine and olives gave a profit; the railroad itself being necessary because England demanded Argentine wool, required by a growing industry, on account of an enlarged market for blankets in the United States. International commerce is thus not a single thread but a mesh, which does not exist unless all concerned are constantly weaving it.

"Owned" colonies unprofitable

When nations fight for colonial markets, they waste their strength. It has been the experience of history that profitable markets cannot be encircled with a Chinese wall. Spain tried to prohibit trade between Spanish America and all other nations and, though she never really succeeded, it was largely on that account that she lost entirely her great domain of South America. A few portions of the globe are similarly closed to outsiders, and they have been in the past. But the testimony of history is that, as soon as

such developed to what can be called colonial manhood, they have been opened. The most successful British possessions, the self-governing dominions, make their own tariffs and even discriminate against England herself.

War paralyzes business

Although the economic necessities that are believed to be the cause of the war are unreal, it is painfully evident that the economic effects of the war itself are not in the least unreal. Business has been tremendously handicapped by the struggle, especially that international commerce in the name of which it is supposably fought. Nothing can be more certain than that the commercial rivalries of the period before the war will be essentially changed by its result. It is not unlikely that European powers generally may at last perceive the fact that trade depends upon trade conditions rather than upon national policies, and that a Bagdad railroad will be just as useful whether built by Germans or by Britons. At any rate, after the war they will probably have so many more pressing problems at home that they will not be very keen about seeking minor advantages at the ends of the earth.

Backward nations, an international problem

This insight into true conditions can be really attained if American and other public opinion can force a new consideration of the colonial problem when peace is made. Our modern world is divided into two parts, the forward and the backward nations. Most people and statesmen believe that fully civilized nations cannot be profitably conquered. The backward nations are chiefly colonies or dependencies and are "owned" by various powers. As a matter of fact, the only policy a colonial power can have that will be permanently desirable for itself is to develop these so that they may become fully civilized and take a useful place in the family of nations. Therefore, though most powers hold dependencies somewhat against the will of their inhabitants, their only justification is the civilizing effect that they may exert over them. This is an international concern. Why, then, should dependencies not be made an international matter?

This has been proposed and is perfectly feasible. If they were internationalized and controlled by the nations as a whole, rather than by single nations, there would no longer be any

room for political rivalries growing out of trade or for the struggle for empire which has been the will-o'-the-wisp of Europe.

The day of such a realization may be hastened by the awful cost of the present war, which is virtually bankrupting every one of the belligerents. After the war, the nations will be so busy setting their own houses in order that they will have little or no time left for adventures overseas. Repairing the damage done by the war will give plenty of opportunity for work, and foreign business, it is to be hoped, will be done on a business basis rather than a political one.

War-made debts

It is almost impossible to realize the economic disturbance of the European war. It was begun in a world with a handicap of debt amounting to nearly 30 billion dollars, with an annual interest charge of a billion and a quarter. After ten months, the war was costing easily two billion dollars a month and will average at least a billion and a half for its whole course. Counting certain indirect losses and the actual estimates of the value of each slain human being as $2500, the total would be nearly three billion

dollars a month. Probably twenty months of war will cost, all told, 50 billion dollars.

The sum is so vast that it becomes only a jumble of figures even to the best-trained imagination. But we can visualize it somewhat. The income of the average American family of five is $600 a year, and the average lifetime is 35 years. From the cradle to the grave the average family, then, spends about $21,000 for food, clothes, pleasure and all the details of living. Let us call it $25,000 per family, and one billion dollars would then support 40,000 families—a city of 200,000 people—through all the days of their lives. And 50 billion dollars would keep one-tenth of the whole population of the present United States.

If one had dropped a dollar every minute into the ocean for nineteen hundred years, one would have thrown away what less than three weeks of the European war has cost in actual value. Only forty-five years ago the Franco-Prussian War was fought for much less than a month's cost of the present war!

Who pays the bill?

Who is going to pay for it all? The bill will go to the people, finally, as do all bills, for the

vast sums demanded are without exception voted by the legislative representatives of the citizens. They vote it, but how can they repay? The loan, not the money, is what they vote; and loans of this sort are not so much money as credit. In other words, the parliaments of belligerents are gambling with credit, and every time they pass a loan bill they virtually bet that the country can pay it back.

This gamble is worth examining. The average loan voted by the belligerents is due to be paid up entirely in about thirty years. When the war is over, there will probably be about thirty billions of indebtedness for it, which means that the countries must pay back at the rate of a billion a year. Before the war, with a debt of like amount to carry, the total budgets of the belligerents amounted to about five billion dollars a year, of which one-sixth went to pay interest charges on debt. With the new debt added, interest alone will take about a third of the revenue, and the present loan bills add another billion to be repaid annually. On that basis, over half of Europe's public income after the war will have to be used to take care of debt alone!

Can Europe pay?

Can Europe, overtaxed before the war, exist on that basis? Could any nation? Upon the answer to that question rests in large measure the future of the world. Yet nothing is more certain than that the nations at war must face substantially the condition here set forth. Perhaps it is inaccurate to speak of a bankrupt nation, but a nation can get into a financial situation where the taxes it must collect to meet obligations consume so large a share of the profits of business that enterprise is discouraged. Europe after the war will be perilously close to that condition.

What, then, can Europe do? First we know that, judging from the past, the fair promises to repay in thirty or even fifty years will not be kept. The debts will be converted, to run for longer terms and at lower rates of interest. That will help somewhat, but it will only ease the situation.

The real way out

Only one way out is apparent, except repudiation of the debts. That way is larger and better international organization, which emphasizes the friendship rather than the enmity of

nations, their possibilities of coöperation rather than their individualistic rivalries. Washington in his Farewell Address thus counseled Americans: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all." America's position in the world has facilitated her following the advice, and all that she stands for among nations can be traced to the degree to which she has done so. While America has in general been following that ideal of systematic friendship, Europe, hampered by different conditions, has been pursuing a historic policy of systematic enmity under which its differences have been exaggerated and kept alive, embittering all political relations.

Until the war, Europe refused to recognize the existence of a real world-society against which a nation could not act with impunity. In the European conception, no duty beyond the nation was admitted, nor right beyond it deemed obtainable except by the sword. No peace, with the least expectation of permanence, can be made on the basis of the old idea. It is notable that now all the belligerents try to give their own cause a world-wide significance for good.

A League of Peace

Thus the war has opened the way for a larger international organization. A league of peace may be the result of the holocaust of bloodshed. It offers the only escape from the burden of debt piled up by the war. If the nations were freed in whole or in part from the maintenance of great military establishments, the money saved would itself keep up all the interest on the new debt. But above all, such a league would emphasize the friendliness of nations rather than their differences, and it would give them a method by which their inevitable differences could be settled without resort to war.

The trouble with Europe has been its bad faith, jealousy and crude notions of economics and, building on those factors, war has come. If Europe will practice good faith and justice and promote world organization half as diligently as it followed the old policies, the fear of international war will disappear and its possibility become almost extinct.

The first step toward world organization, aptly called a league of peace, would have a tremendous effect and would particularly take out of international affairs many of the questions which in the past have been almost in-

soluble. The operation of the United States Congress shows the result of such an organization. If each State made its own tariffs, there would be untold difficulties within the country over customs duties, and perhaps we should have tariff wars. But Congress makes the tariff for the whole country, and the battles of a locality for a particular rate are fought out in Congress with words and arguments only.

It is generally felt that, in addition to this, some method of enforcing the decisions of a league should be provided for. Such a league will naturally develop a court system and will employ commissions of inquiry to establish questions of fact. The League to Enforce Peace proposed in June, 1915, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, would in addition provide for dealing with all disputes that can not be adjudicated in court. To enforce decisions, combined economic and military force is proposed on the remote contingency that any member of the league were faithless to its pledge after being ensured security and justice. As such a League increased in membership, the design would be that the armaments of each would gradually diminish.

CHAPTER VI

Race Problems of World Contact

BY RUBY G. SMITH, PH.D.

Shanghai and New York are in closer touch to-day than were New York and Baltimore in 1800. Indeed, man's conquest of the natural barriers to his migration and communication, has so advanced that oceans connect rather than separate. Since civilization progresses by the mutual exchange of ideas, it is significant that international exchange of ideas and products has been multiplied more since Washington's day than in all previous history. The father of our country could travel no faster than could Abraham and Moses.

A world partnership

This contact of each part of the world with every other has transformed the American home within a few centuries from a log cabin to a cosmopolitan creation that may include Greek architecture, Persian rugs, South American

coffee, African cooks, Chinese silks, German toys, Arctic furs, Japanese tea, Italian olives, Hawaiian sugar, and the art, music, news, and literature of the world. In short, we draw our daily resources from many lands, exacting tribute of other races for the most frugal meal and the humblest dwelling. Each nation barters what it can best produce for what it needs from others. Thus has been brought about, the planet around, an interdependent human society,—a world partnership.

This world partnership has economic, æsthetic, sociologic results; moreover, it has become vital to the existence of the world's large aggregations of population in cities. It is said that New York would succumb to famine in a week, were transportation cut off.

A partial severance of world contact of four stockholders in the world partnership occurred during the San Francisco fire, the Messina earthquake, the Ohio floods, and when Belgium became a battleground. Plague, famine and death were diverted from Belgium, Ohio, Messina and San Francisco by another form of coöperation —the altruistic—that sent a prompt response to the modernized cry of, "Come over into Macedonia and help us."

What are right relations for the races of men?

World contact has developed a knowledge and an interest between people of every nation. It has also brought mankind face to face with the problem of what are right relations for the varied races that were differentiated during their long isolation. For the period of isolation, when "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet," has passed away forever.

Do historical facts throw light on the question as to America's duty toward other races? History furnishes convincing evidence of the wrong way to solve the racial problem, and but little evidence of ways that are Christian and right. And since a question is never settled until it is settled right, but few of the racial problems of world contact have found solution because old formulas of government do not fit the modern, interdependent world. A few historic examples of the wrong way to handle race problems prove the need of new formulas better fitted to the realities of the modern world.

The ideal of empire

The historic ideal that has guided most of the relations between different races has been that

of empire which seeks to prescribe for the world the domination of a single race and its type of civilization. This idea created the transitory empires of Babylon, Egypt, Persia, Rome and Napoleon. It still persists as a vestige of the past in the visionary Pan-Asiatic, Pan-Aryan, Pan-Slavic, and Pan-German empires. Some of the most restive products of this imperialistic formula of racial relations may be seen in the Balkan States whose artificial political frontiers are more closely related to the supposed interests of the European Powers than to the racial, lingual or religious affinities of the Balkan populations.

Repeated and dissimilar dissections of the Balkan peninsula have resulted in perhaps the most continuous and most tragic refugee movements in history. For each change of frontiers was followed by attempts to eradicate through conversion, banishment, or massacre all elements alien in religion or speech, no provision having been made, even when the Great Powers did the shuffling, for safe-guarding personal and property rights. Had the European Powers unselfishly and sincerely aided cooperation in the Balkans, and planned their organization in harmony with religious, language

and racial cleavages, the European war might never have occurred.

Barriers of language and political frontiers

This same policy of politico-linguistic intolerance still pervades many imperialistic countries, applied to some extent in Poland, Finland, Alsace-Lorraine, Italia Irredenta, Schleswig, Bosnia, Herzegovina and the Power-made Albania. The futility of trying to crush out by force what is native and distinctive is demonstrated by the failures of Hungary to Magyarize Croatia, of Austria to Austrianize her imperial agglomeration of unrelated subjects, and of Germany to Germanize the French in Alsace-Lorraine, or the Poles in her slice of Poland. Europe has had more experience in meeting the race problem than any other continent, because of the proximity of the parts of Europe's mosaic of races.

Space forbids discussion of our urgent Philippine problem which is not precisely a race problem. Its solution is independence of the islands, as speedily as may be, with protection through treaties of neutralization; friendly guidance through chosen foreign advisers and custom collectors; and fraternal instead of imperialistic or paternal help.

Were Europe freed of the curse of Babel, less would be heard of racial antagonisms, for language has become the chief distinguishing characteristic among Europeans, who are all Caucasians whose inter-marriage has largely swamped distinctive racial characteristics. In America, aided by a common tongue, all of the European varieties of men have found a common denominator.

The democratic solution

America's democratic policy regarding race differences is, with the exception of the negro problem, in sharp contrast with the imperialistic policy which has failed in Europe. Imperialism is based on the assumption of the right of the superior race to dominate. Democracy is based on the assumption of the fundamental equality of rights of all races, despite their superficial differences. The British Empire is a unit because England learned from our Revolution not to coerce Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

At the start, the United States defined for the world the only race-policy that fits the realities —that of the widest fraternal, rather than paternal, tolerance of human diversity—in the belief "that all men are created equal." This

conception is a difficult one to apply to practical politics, and it is not surprising that the United States Government, with its changing personnel, has at times lost sight of this foundation principle.

Challenges of American democracy

The chief challenge of America's fraternal democracy came in the institution of slavery. The burning necessity to make valid our theoretical assertion of equality was abundantly and tragically shown in the story of America's Civil War. America vindicated her racial democracy by war,—the most costly, and uncertain method possible. Rationalism and good will, instead of armies and navies, must be mobilized for meeting the new challenge of American democracy,—the quickening Orient.

America has found that the Chinese, the Japanese, the Filipino, and other Asiatic people exhibit ability and character, and are generally equal and in some respects superior, except where specific training has been lacking. The races we do not like are the races we do not know.

Asiatic-American friendship

America has done much to merit the proverbial confidence of China. Li Hung Chang said, "While America was the only country of the world which denied admittance to our countrymen, it was also the only nation which stood like the Great Wall between China and dismemberment." It was our return of the Chinese indemnity, which was an over-payment, that set a new standard in international ethics. China has wisely used her restored indemnity for educating her youth in American universities where they rank as excellent students. Their high ideals and loyalty to the new republic inspire confidence that China will have wise leadership.

Dr. Jordan writes, "The Japanese everywhere feel toward America a peculiar, almost romantic gratitude. It was America who, in 1854, first opened Japan to the activities of the West. . . . It was America who led in the establishment of the Japanese school system and the great Imperial University of Tokio. . . . America is Japan's nearest and best friend among the nations, her guide and leader in paths which are new and strange."

Shall Asia and America succumb to military madness?

The United States can foster the friendship of China and Japan, by dealing rationally with misunderstandings that may rise between America and the Orient. Certain misunderstandings exist now that if allowed to ferment, may lead to oriental militarism that would divert resources from human progress and might, as in Europe, end in war and bankruptcy. A militarized Orient would lead us to huge expenditure in defense against it. Thoughts of China militarized stagger the imagination, for, as the sole survivor of ancient nations, because the non-military one, China's population has not been depleted by war and is vastly greater than that of any other race. Imagine a nation of more than three hundred millions forced by Christian civilization to arm when for more than nineteen centuries it had despised war! Shall America be apathetic in face of the appalling possibilities of the military example of Christendom?

State rights versus treaty rights

The chief existing cause for Asiatic antagonism is the failure of the United States to provide adequate legislation for fulfilling her treaty

obligations. By treaty, the United States pledges herself to accord Orientals privileges in America that are accorded to "citizens of the most favored nation." China and Japan accord such privileges to Americans. By statute, Asiatics are denied naturalization and citizenship here. And because of the hazy delimitation of state rights, certain States have found technical grounds for discriminatory anti-Asiatic legislation. Examples of state legislation concerning a question of international scope are the Alien Land Laws of several States resembling those passed in California, against the protests of Japan and our federal government, in 1913. The yellow journals of California misrepresented her attitude toward the law by failing to report that many earnest citizens and state organizations opposed it. This temporarily solves a local problem in an unjust and impolitic way, but it may later threaten the peace of America and the Orient. Out of 11,000,000 acres of farm-land the Japanese owned only 13,000, yet statements were published and believed to the effect that the Japanese "owned and controlled in California fertile land equal to a strip five miles wide the entire length of the State."

The fact that the immigration problem in

America is largely localized near ports of entry, suggests that fairness demands that means be provided whereby the burden of this question may be distributed over the United States. When our immigration laws are properly revised, no single State should receive an overload of aliens. These can be administered by a National Employment Bureau, acting as a distributing agency, which will determine each State's quota by stipulating annually in advance its maximum capacity for alien assimilation.

New immigration laws rather than new military defenses

Laws providing for federal control of aliens should be urged upon Congress by all loyal Americans. Discriminatory state-legislation and local mob-violence against aliens are the chief causes of our international misunderstandings. Foreign governments can have no relations with our separate States, yet hold the United States responsible for state violations of our treaties. Under our Constitution, no State can deal directly with another nation. All such powers are reserved to the federal government. All aliens are therefore wards, not of individual States, but of the United States. Presidents Harrison, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft urged

Congress to enact laws that would enable the administration to give aliens the care guaranteed by our treaties. No constitutional difficulty intervenes; yet no action has been taken. Ex-president Taft says such action would be more effective to prevent the possibility of war than would improving our military defenses.

Impartial immigration laws

It is urged that the preservation of American institutions be guaranteed by limiting immigration to the number who will readily assimilate our American ideals. But limitations must be universal and free from race discrimination. Standards for admission and citizenship can be raised as high as needed, but must be applied impartially to all races so that whoever qualifies individually can become an American; otherwise the sensitive Oriental nations may be deeply and dangerously embittered.

A third proposal, coming from Mr. Taft, is for federal control of aliens through registration and supervision during their preparation for citizenship. This provides restraint against lawlessness until admitted to citizenship which should be with an impressive ritual. Federal jurisdiction of aliens would tend to check mob violence and when it occurs, injustice by a jury

in sympathy with the lynchers would no longer be possible.

The five per cent. idea

Prof. Sidney L. Gulick, for many years a missionary in Japan, proposes a plan which has great value. He says that since the best assimilative agency for immigrants "consists of those of the same nation that are already naturalized and know the languages, customs, ideals, political and social life of both peoples," therefore "all immigration should be limited to a definite per cent. per annum from each people, of those from that people already naturalized with American-born children of the first generation. . . . Five per cent. suggests itself as a suitable rate with which to begin the experiment." With the present foreign-born population in America, this five per cent. plan would admit relatively few from southern Europe, and very few indeed from Japan. But being universal in application, the five per cent. plan commends itself as just to all. From the outcry made against Japanese in California one would imagine that they numbered at least a half-million, in that State alone, whereas in the whole country there are less than 100,000.

Professor Gulick says of Japan, "Her sense

of national dignity is affronted. Japan regards as highly humiliating the proposals now before Congress in several forms to make general Asiatic exclusion laws. This situation is the more painful to her because until lately our relations have been so ideal. In spite of recent rebuffs and unkind words and treatment, there is a remarkable spirit of patience and moderation. But it can not be denied that her friendly feelings and her admiration for America have considerably cooled."

Japan's attitude

The assumption that Japan wants the Philippines has no foundation. The Japanese commission which examined the islands years ago reported that the climate prohibited successful colonization. It is doubtful whether Japan, whose interests are on the Continent, would care to accept them as a gift if she had the expense of fortifying them. Our own naval expense has been doubled in consequence of our Pacific possessions. The annual war-scare about Japan, which has flared up regularly just before the vote on naval appropriations, has been created by a few fanatics who wanted excuse for a huge navy.

How America might lead

America can set now a new international standard by showing that it is a one-sided policy to spend "millions for defense but not one cent" for the deliberate, systematic cultivation of the non-military defenses of just laws, international service and an intelligent understanding. The price of one single torpedo-boat-destroyer would provide lectures on Oriental problems in every college; for exchange of visits of American and Asiatic statesmen and for wide newspaper publicity as to important facts which are little known. All this would largely allay trouble.

One dollar spent now on preventive measures against friction and ill-will would probably save us a thousand that may be needed later if Asia arms. Now is the supremely critical period when we may make friends or foes. At this time, when policy has not crystallized, women can perform a great international service. Every woman's club should discuss our duty to the Orient. Every matron who can invite as a guest to her home some Oriental student will be amply rewarded by acquaintance with a bright youth, who may wield great power

a few years hence and to whom her courtesy will help interpret what America stands for.

America is still the "land of opportunity." It may have little power to help rebuild a devastated Europe, but its influence might largely redeem the rising millions beyond the setting sun from the necessity of following Europe's bloody path. The time to use that influence is Now.

CHAPTER VII

Moral and Religious Aspects of the War Against War

BY ANNA GARLIN SPENCER

Loud and accusing voices are to-day challenging the advocates of world peace with the questions,—Would you choose peace at the cost of righteousness? Peace at cost of honor? Peace at cost of chivalrous defense of the weak and outraged? The inference that such is the present day alternative is accepted by these questioners as settled fact. We deny the inference and declare the questions to rest on unsound bases.

Whatever might have been the value of war, and physical struggle for supremacy between tribe and tribe and between nation and nation in the earlier stages of human development, to-day the real questions which are before the world for settlement are these,—Will you choose war and preparation for war at cost of righteousness, of justice, of honor, of service of

the strong to the weak? The real questions of ethics with which the problems of world organization and world peace are concerned to-day are those which inhere in the choice between the selfish and the childish conceptions of social relationship and the broad, the unselfish and the mature conceptions of human association for mutual well-being.

At this point the new concepts and the oncoming sentiments of religion are most in evidence as reënforcement of the peace cause.

The new idea of God

The movement of progress in religion is steadily toward the rationalizing, the socializing and the spiritualizing of religion. The old man-god in the heavens, the tribal and national god, loving only his own chosen people and bidding his favorites slay all outside their own tribe or nation as enemies and aliens, is fading from the idealism of the enlightened. It is true, and this war demonstrates the tragic fact, that there are still multitudes who can go forth to slaughter their fellowmen and believe that they have thus served God. But more and more among the moral and intellectual élite of earth is growing the worship of God as Spirit, as Father of all human spirits, as the One

whose name is Truth and whose habitation is Law. More and more the infinite is revealed as the Light that lighteneth every man who cometh into the world.

Oneness of human kind

This progress of rationalizing and spiritualizing religion is bringing together in unity of spirit the thinkers of all lands and the devout of all ages and all faiths. When once a human life has been touched by this sense of the oneness of all human kind at its topmost reach of aspiration, the thought becomes intolerable of war between these atoms of humanity who are as the seamless vesture of the Soul of the universe. The old ideas that made love of one's own country seem one and the same thing as hating all neighbor countries take their historic place as the outgrown expression of the infant mind of the race, so soon as religion becomes mature. Then the infinite whom we worship is perceived in universal relationship, as the Spirit in whom all alike live and move and have their true being. If to-day, as by a miracle, every man and woman of the warring nations could see as clearly as Jesus saw that God is the common Father and all mankind are brothers, they could neither slay nor praise the slayers on any

battlefield. The deepest difficulty to-day is that the religion of the truly devout spirits and the truly emancipated minds is not yet established in rightful command over the conduct of mankind.

In the relation of individual man and woman toward one another we do see a deepening sense of the sacredness of life; a broadening conception of the waste of friction and of the shame of cruelty. In the relationship of nations with nations, however, we have not yet applied the larger conceptions of the principles of righteousness and justice already realized to so great an extent in personal life.

Practical atheism

The reason for this inconsistency is not alone the pressure of economic needs not yet rightly understood; it is not the existence of ancient national feuds born of the cruelty and outrage of past wars, nor yet the deep and instinctive action of race prejudice. Neither is it the suspicion engendered by inherited differences of development. All these play their part in the bondage of the modern world to outgrown ideals of patriotism and the supposed need to "prepare" for warfare with other nations.

Below all these, however, and rising above

them in moments of intense feeling, is the childish idea that each nation has its own god, and that each nation therefore can secure divine help in fighting another nation. If once the common mind realized the world-God as alone possible to thought, the world-brotherhood would be an inevitable corollary. To organize agencies like armies and navies, to keep alive race hatreds, national jealousies, and international strife, would then become an impossible thing. The underlying reason, the deepest call for the peace movement is this,—that war and the militaristic preparation for war are atheism; atheism, monstrous and incredible in this enlightened age, atheism against that Life of all, the fountain of all human life!

Growth of sympathy

However the religion that now is, and is growing day by day in power, is showing in a thousand ways the world-wide operation of the laws of ethical and social relationship. All fraternal and constructive, all peaceful human association is rooted in sympathy. It is the power of putting one's self in the place of another, the ability to feel in kinship of spirit the pain or the joy of another human being, that makes possible human comradeship for mutual aid and

mutual well-being. At first that root of sympathy had only near and close expression. "The mother and child constituted the first social group," bound together from remotest past in service of the stronger to the weak. Then the father came into the blended life of family-care for offspring. Then the group of blood-kin learned they were meant to help each other. Then the tribal, and later, the national ideal, were born, out of the sense of kinship and the widening play of human sympathy; and large groups of human beings were banded together for mutual aid and mutual good will. In each of these successive stages each enlarging group kept firm the inherited conviction that loyalty to those within the bond meant suspicion, and the warlike attitude toward all outside the bond. Within the national life, patriotism, born of the sanction of religion for devotion to fatherland and the deep instinctive liking for one's own kind, has become one of the most intense and masterful of the idealisms of humanity. Patriotism has outgrown blood-kinship; it has fibered itself upon common art-sympathy and labor-sympathies, common economic demands and political habits and educational tendencies.

Limitation of sympathy

Here, for millions of even cultivated and intelligent people, the sense of kinship ends; here the capacity to sympathize stops; here the ideal of mutual aid and fraternal feeling finds its limiting band; here, where love of one's own country translates itself into an active patriotism. That beyond our own nation lies the land of the enemy and the alien is still the sentiment of countless otherwise enlightened people. Most of these persons are not fully conscious of that limitation of human sympathy until, or unless, some sudden conflict of economic interest or political ambition stirs the subconscious feeling to active life. Raphael and Beethoven, Newton and Edison, Shakespeare and Homer, Alfred the Great and Abraham Lincoln belong to all times and all lands. They make a world republic of the human mind and heart. They make a world republic of the higher life of mankind. But the number of persons is lamentably small who can deal in a national sense and an international conscience with "righteousness," "justice" and "honor" and with the claim of the weak upon the strong for succor. For this republic of the world of ethics and of political association the human race waits. It needs the

development of a genuine sense of the social solidarity of all mankind. And it is a socialized religion that must teach this basic truth.

Childish concepts

If loud and censorious voices assail, as "enemies of their country," leaders in the cause of international peace, it is because the average religious and ethical concepts are still childish. They are still bounded by national selfishness. The peace cause is still supposed by many persons, and in all honesty, to be inimical to patriotism and opposed to national morality. Were it possible to show such people what any sound mastery of social science may show, they would see that ethics is not a national but a world law; that the same sense of kinship which has worked in family, tribe and nation to the building of justice and mutual aid must work in the family of nations to build a world order of justice and well being.

Fundamental relationship

There must be world cures for all social ills. If religion were to-day baptized with the spirit that makes "membership in the human family in good and regular standing" a more fundamental relationship than any other bond of hu-

man association, then the peace cause would be seen to be, what it really is—an effort to secure the fundamental basis for that fundamental relationship of world brotherhood. As it is today, the most cheering element of all in the present world situation is this, that in proportion as men and women have the rational, social and spiritual religion, which is increasing day by day, in that proportion is seen the necessity for the use of law and social condemnation instead of dynamite and guns to secure true social advance. Many are convinced of this better use of "weapons not carnal" in the upbuilding of the kingdom of righteousness and human well-being who are still confused in the application of the principle to national ideals. It is not for naught, however, that worshippers in temples, Jewish, Christian, Buddhist, Brahminical and what-not have offered prayers in all tongues to the God of all the earth. It is not in vain, even if saddest inconsistencies have divorced creed and deed that, in all the sacred places of most of the nations now at war with one another, the name of the Prophet of Nazareth has been extolled as that of the Master of the religious life. It is not without meaning that in spite of the cruelties and outrages of this awful insanity of militaristic intoxication, the cross of the Prince

of Peace gleams far above the clouds of the battlefields. When this fever of the blood has cooled, when the real meaning of national honor and national gain is perceived, then the fact that those who have acted so inhumanly toward each other have still learned to feel spiritually akin at the heart of their being will make the healing more sure and easy. That antiphonal service of last Christmas Eve when the French and the German soldiers sang responsively their hymns of love and joy from the trenches dug for savage conflict, and the still air of night echoed to the peaceful strains of those brought into deep communion of spirit by a common worship, that service was not a mockery. It was a prophecy, and its memory will outlast its hideous accompaniment.

The new idealism

There is need of a revival of religion; a conscious, purposed, application of this already generated, but as yet hardly conscious unity, of the spirit in the bond of peace. It must not be a revival of religion which is merely a survival of outgrown ideals and obsolete concepts galvanized to seeming vigor by an hour of popular excitement. It must be a revival of the old spirit of devotion to make vital to the common

conscience and the mass intelligence the new faith and the new idealism of mankind.

There are signs already that such a revival is at hand. A religion is already born so moral that it cannot tolerate wholesale murder of human life; a religion so rational that it will soon make all, even the stupid, see the futility of trying to decide questions of right and wrong by gauge of battle, or trying to secure economic well-being by the reckless destruction of the stored-up wealth of the ages. It is a religion so social that it will not longer tolerate the idea, even less the practice, of leaving vast regions of human conduct outside the reign of justice, but will insist on bringing all the concerns of human life under the sovereignty of Law. It is a religion so spiritual that it will make clear even to all the dull, the wonder and majesty of the revelation of the infinite in each man and woman and child, and thus demonstrate to every conscience that the destruction of this priceless fabric of human life in rage or selfishness is sacrilege, like unto the murder of a divinity.

Unconscious evangels

Such a religion is dawning. Its prophetic promise shines on the horizon beyond the battlefields. We catch its vision in the new spirit

of the youth of our universities who see clearly that they are called to war, not "against flesh and blood, but against the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places." We hear its echoing, "Thus saith the Lord" in the brave words of many preachers of every religious communion. We read its sure affirmation in the new and passionate revolt of women, the life-nourishers, against war's destruction. Above all we see it presaged, beyond peradventure, by those least consistent in their response to its evangel, least conscious of the fact that they are the prophet-teachers of a new and a better religion; namely the publicists and the teachers, the editors and the writers, the artists and the poets, who speak through our public press. Religions are not made in a hidden sanctuary by shut-in priests. They are not evolved from the inner consciousness of philosophers in close meditation. These efforts of priests and philosophers but analyze, or translate into creeds, religious already born.

"Love's Coming of Age"

Religion grows like every other manifestation of the higher life of mankind. And religion has now outgrown its babyhood of weakness, superstition and fear, its adolescence of ex-

aggerated individualism, its early selfishness of special claim upon Divine favor. It is growing into its adult phase of disciplined thought, of tender sympathy, of unselfish service. This that we witness to-day, namely the springing up, like wild flowers on ancient battlefields, of innumerable "plans" for the "Parliament of man, the Federation of the World," is the many-sided witness to "Love's Coming of Age" in the religion of the mature spirit. These multitudinous "plans" to "make this war end war" are some of them wise and some not so wise; are some of them the fruit of long years of patient study, and some, the mushroom growths of mere sensitiveness to the movings of the Time-Spirit; but they are all a proof that a new gospel is singing in the heavens of man's idealism above the groans of the dying and the noise of guns that shock our senses. Plain, simple-hearted people are catching the strains; even the dullest and least able to rightly interpret the gospel are moved by it. Side by side with calls to a "preparedness" which could mean, if obeyed, a backset in the United States toward savagery and childishness, such as our country never yet has suffered, are printed messages looking toward "world courts" and calling on all sane people to make this "the last war."

The inconsistency, which would be laughable were the situation less tragic, is not the vital thing in all this stir and stress. The vital thing is that the common mind, the collective intelligence is being moved towards the goal of world organization in the interests of universal peace and human welfare. Meanwhile, he is an "enemy to his country" as well as an obstructionist to world progress who still lives in that outgrown area of a narrow, sectional patriotism and its local and limited ethics. Let us all arise and go hence into that larger place made ready for us. Let us all ascend to that higher level in which we shall see clearly the oneness of the law by which the stars move in order and the life of man moves onward from better towards the best.

APPENDICES

Constructive Plans for Permanent Peace

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTIONS

Adopted by the Conference on International Relations consisting of delegates from forty American Colleges and Universities, held under the auspices of the World Peace Foundation at Cornell University, June 15–30, 1915.

WHEREAS: Recent events have shown that the lives of American and other neutral citizens, and the rights of American and other neutral commerce on the high seas, cannot be made secure by America's taking part in a war in which both sides are, in some measure, straining and violating the law, and are supporting an interpretation of law which would leave those rights without due protection in the future,—

We respectfully submit that the protection of American rights requires the development and reform of existing international law, so as to secure:

(1) An international legislative body for the framing of such law, and,

(2) An international court for its just interpretation, and,

(3) An international arrangement for the due execution of the court's decision by such combination of economic or military measures as may be most effective.

And we further respectfully urge, as an action which can now be taken by the American Government and as a step towards the achievement of these four results, that the other republics of this hemisphere be invited to confer with our own concerning their common willingness to ordain and support concerted efforts to secure due consideration for neutral rights and interests at the settlement following the present war.

These resolutions shall be sent to President Wilson, to the members of the Congress of the United States, and to the Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

"If we allow present practice of the Allies to become the precedent for international law, we shall have to accept its operation when others apply that law, even though we may believe the cause for which they are fighting a bad one. We must accept it even in the cause in which we do not believe or place ourselves grievously in the wrong.

"The sea is the highway of the world, and to civilize sea-law is to internationalize the world."

—*Norman Angell.*

APPENDIX B

A League to Enforce Peace.

Conference held in Philadelphia in Independence Hall June 17, 1915.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

"We believe and solemnly urge that the time has come to devise and to create a working union of sovereign na-

tions to establish peace among themselves, and to guarantee it by all known and available sanctions at their command, to the end that civilization may be conserved, and the comfort of mankind in comfort, enlightenment and happiness may continue.

"We therefore believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following:

"1. All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitation of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

"2. All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.

"3. The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

"4. Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the Judicial Tribunal mentioned in article one."

The President of the League is Hon. William H. Taft and the chairman of the executive committee is President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University.

The plan of the League deserves universal consideration.

In its essential features, it offers the most hopeful means yet devised toward eventual world-organization and the replacement of rival armies by an international police. It however seems by no means necessary to its success that each nation should be pledged to exert military as well as economic compulsion in the unlikely contingency of their being needed. In case of a European member of the League proving faithless, it should be previously agreed that the force exercised by the United States should be that of non-intercourse with contribution of money and supplies to those who used military force. This non-military force could be exerted with the speed of a telegraphic order from Washington, and far more speedily than mobilizing a fleet. Some of the weaker European nations could exert enormous pressure by prohibiting the passage of supplies, mail and telegrams to the nation that is ostracized. Concerted economic pressure will gradually be recognized as an immense power.

A very important contribution to the whole subject which is so new and little understood appeared from the pen of Norman Angell in the *Saturday Evening Post* of July 25, 1915. —*Editor.*

APPENDIX C

Extracts from Address of Edward A. Filene, Chairman of the Special Committee on Terms of Settlement of Peace of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and a Member of the Philadelphia Convention of the League to Enforce Peace.

"Economic pressure, which I believe American business men will almost unanimously favor as preliminary to military pressure, doesn't mean disarmament. It means the

employment of an economic boycott before resorting to military forces. Economic boycott can be used in any one of the 12 following ways, and probably there are many others:

"(a) To lay an embargo on any or all ships within the jurisdiction of such constituent state of states registered as belonging to the recalcitrant state:

"(b) To prohibit any lending of capital or other moneys to the citizens, companies, or subordinate administrations of the recalcitrant state, or to its national government;

"(c) To prohibit the issue or dealing in or quotation on the Stock Exchange or in the press of any new loans, debentures, shares, notes or securities of any kind by any of the citizens, companies or subordinate administrations of the recalcitrant state, or of its national government;

"(d) To prohibit all postal, telegraphic, telephonic and wireless communication with the recalcitrant state;

"(e) To prohibit the payment of any debts due to the citizens, companies or subordinate administrations of the recalcitrant state, or to its national government; and, if thought fit, to direct that payment of such debts shall be made only to one or other of the constituent governments, which shall give a good and legally valid discharge for the same, and shall account for the net proceeds thereof to the international high court;

"(f) To prohibit all imports, or certain specified imports, coming from the recalcitrant state, or originating within it;

"(g) To prohibit all exports, or certain specified exports consigned directly to the recalcitrant state, or destined for it;

"(h) To prohibit all passenger traffic (other than the exit of foreigners) whether by ship, railway, canal or road, to or from the recalcitrant state;

"(i) To prohibit the entrance into any port of the constituent states of any of the ships registered as belonging to the recalcitrant state, except so far as may be necessary for any of them to seek safety, in which case such ship or ships shall be interned;

"(j) To declare and enforce a decree of complete non-intercourse with the recalcitrant state, including all the above-mentioned measures of partial non-intercourse;

"(k) To levy a special export duty on all goods destined for the recalcitrant state, accounting for the net proceeds to the international high court;

"(l) To furnish a contingent of warships to maintain a combined blockade of one or more of the ports, or of the whole coastline of the recalcitrant state.[1]

"The argument is sometimes made that economic forces used against a nation will be more expensive than using military force first. But this argument forgets that it is quite impossible for a nation to use its military power without at the same time using the economic boycott.

"The advantage of using economic boycott force is that it would be possible to adjust some of the losses of the war so that it would fall more equitably on all classes of society instead of on one class. This was done in England and other countries at the beginning of this war by the credits allowed on debts due to nationalists on advances on securities, on protection to moratorium and similar measures."

[1] Further details in regard to the use of these twelve economic sanctions are given in the special supplement to *The New Statesman*, London, July 17, 1915.

APPENDIX D

Summary of the Chief Resolutions and Recommendations of the International Congress of Women at The Hague, April 28—May 1

1. No transference of territory without the consent of the men and women residing therein.
2. Reference of future international disputes to arbitration and conciliation.
3. Use of social, moral and economic pressure to bear upon any country which resorts to arms.
4. Democratic control of foreign policy.
5. The Enfranchisement of Women.
6. The convening of the Third Hague Conference immediately after the war.
7. International organization, to include a permanent international Court of Justice to settle justiciable questions and a permanent International Conference holding regular meetings which should appoint a permanent Council of Conciliation and Investigation.
8. Government control of manufacture of and traffic in arms and munitions of war as a step toward universal disarmament.
9. Liberty of commerce and free trade routes.
10. No secret treaties.
11. Education of children in peace ideals.

APPENDIX E

Minimum Program

Conference at The Hague, April 7–10, 1915

1. No annexation or transfer of territory shall be made contrary to the interests and wishes of the population con-

cerned. Where possible their consent shall be obtained by plebiscite or otherwise.

The States shall guarantee to the various nationalities included in their boundaries equality before the law, religious liberty and the free use of their native languages.

2. The States shall agree to introduce in their colonies, protectorates and spheres of influence, liberty of commerce, or at least equal treatment for all nations.

3. The work of The Hague Conferences with a view to the peaceful organization of the Society of Nations shall be developed.

The Hague Conference shall be given a permanent organization and meet at regular intervals.

The States shall agree to submit all their disputes to peaceful settlement. For this purpose there shall be created, in addition to the existent Hague Court of Arbitration, (a) a permanent Court of International Justice, (b) a permanent international Council of Investigation and Conciliation. The States shall bind themselves to take concerted action, diplomatic, economic or military, in case any State should resort to military measures instead of submitting the dispute to judicial decision or to the mediation of the Council of Investigation and Conciliation.

4. The States shall agree to reduce their armaments. In order to facilitate the reduction of naval armaments the right of capture shall be abolished and the freedom of the seas assured.

5. Foreign policy shall be under the effective control of the parliaments of the respective nations.

Secret treaties shall be void.

Invitations were sent, in conjunction with similar organizations in Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries, by the "Nederlandsche Anti-Oorlog Raad" to a limited

number of persons. The meeting was composed of more than thirty prominent people, internationalists from Austria, Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America.

Letters of sympathy were also received from Denmark, France, Italy and Spain.

The program was unanimously adopted after full discussion.

APPENDIX F

Program for Constructive Peace of the Woman's Peace Party. Adopted at Washington, D. C., January 10, 1915

I. To Secure the Cessation of Hostilities:

1. We urge our government to call a conference of representative delegates from the neutral nations to discuss possible measures to lessen their own injuries, to hasten the cessation of hostilities, and to prevent warfare in the future.
2. In case an official conference of the kind named above proves impossible or impracticable, we pledge ourselves to work toward the summoning of an unofficial conference of the pacifists of the world to consider points named.

II. To Insure Such Terms of Settlement as Will Prevent This War from Being but the Prelude to New Wars:

1. No province should be transferred as a result of conquest from one government to another against the will of the people. Whenever possible, the desire of a province for autonomy should be respected.

2. No war indemnities should be assessed save when recognized international law has been violated.
3. No treaty alliance or other international arrangement should be entered upon by any nation unless ratified by the representatives of the people. Adequate measures for assuring democratic control of foreign policy should be adopted by all nations.

III. To Place the Future Peace of the World Upon Securer Foundation:

1. Foreign policies of nations should not be aimed at creating alliances for the purpose of maintaining the *"balance of power,"* but should be directed to the establishment of a *"Concert of Nations,"* with
   (a) *A court, or courts,* for the settlement of all disputes between nations;
   (b) An *international congress,* with legislative and administrative powers over international affairs, and with permanent committees in place of present secret diplomacy;
   (c) An *international police force.*
2. As an immediate step in this direction, a permanent League of Neutral Nations ("League of Peace") should be formed, whose members should bind themselves to settle all difficulties arising between them by arbitration, judicial, or legislative procedure, and who should create an international police force for mutual protection against attack.
3. *National disarmament* should be effected in the following manner: It should be contingent upon the adoption of this peace program by a sufficient number of nations, or by nations of sufficient

power to insure protection to those disarmed. It should be graduated in each nation to the degree of disarmament effected in the other nations, and progressively reduced until finally complete.

4. Pending general disarmament, all manufactories of arms, ammunitions and munitions for use in war should hereafter be national property.
5. The *protection of private property at sea,* of neutral commerce and of communications should be secured by the *neutralization of the seas* and of such maritime trade routes as the British Channel, Dardanelles, Panama, Suez, the Straits of Gibraltar, etc.
6. National and international action should be secured to remove *the economic causes of war.*
7. The democracies of the world should be extended and reënforced by general application of the principle of self-government, including the extension of *suffrage to women.*

IV. Immediate National Program for the United States:

1. We approve the Peace Commission Treaties which our country has negotiated with thirty nations, stipulating delay and investigation for the period of a year before any declaration of war can take place. We express the hope that all other countries will be included.
2. We protest against the increase of armaments by the United States. We insist that the increase of the army and navy at this time, so far from being in the interest of peace, is a direct threat to the well-being of other nations with whom we have dealings, an imputation of doubt of their good

faith, and calculated to compel them in turn to increase their armies, and in consequence to involve us in an ever-intensifying race for military supremacy.

3. We recommend to the President and Government of the United States that a commission of men and women be created, with an adequate appropriation, whose duty shall be to work for the prevention of war and the formulation of the most compelling and practical methods of world organization.

APPENDIX G

Union of Democratic Control. Its Four Cardinal Points

1. No Province shall be transferred from one Government to another without the consent by plebiscite of the population of such province.

2. No Treaty Arrangement or Undertaking shall be entered upon in the name of Great Britain without the sanction of Parliament. Adequate machinery for ensuring democratic control of foreign policy shall be created.

3. The Foreign Policy of Great Britain shall not be aimed at creating Alliances for the purpose of maintaining the "Balance of Power"; but shall be directed to the establishment of a "Concert of the Powers and the setting up of an International Council whose deliberations and decisions shall be public, part of the labor of such council to be the creation of definite treaties of arbitration and the establishment of Courts for their interpretation and enforcement.

4. Great Britain shall propose as part of the Peace set-

tlement a plan for the drastic reduction, by consent, of the armaments of all the belligerent Powers, and to facilitate that policy shall attempt to secure the general nationalization of the manufacture of armaments, and the control of the export of armaments by one country to another.

The Union of Democratic Control publishes a series of valuable penny pamphlets on the war and its problems, written by Norman Angell and some of the most impartial and progressive of the younger publicists of England.

Headquarters, 37 Norfolk Street, Strand London.

—*Editor.*

APPENDIX H

Racial Contacts and Cohesions as factors in the unconstrained fabric of a world at peace

"Europe must be all Teuton or all Slav." It was said without special conviction, as one reproduces a universally repeated catchword that no one challenges. It was evidently a part of the accepted *Weltanschauung* from which my Viennese acquaintance derived. As we all know, it is that for untold numbers.

It is not only a widely accepted point of view; it is a very ancient one. And it is one of a very large family. *Delenda est Carthago* is one of its forbears. It is not limited to Germans nor to any one group. "Britannia rules the waves" is of close kin. So is "ôtes-toi de là, que je

m'y mette." So is the immigration clause recently proposed by the Senate, excluding black people as black, regardless of means, character, capacity or pressing reasons for coming.

This feeling is part of our ancient brute inheritance, and it has more than one root deep-twined in the past.

One of these roots is that "consciousness of kind" which links us close to those most like ourselves. One is that dread and dislike of the stranger which made the same word serve the Roman for both foeman and foreigner. It draws from even deeper and more animal levels in the physical struggle for survival.

Yet this long descent does not validate it. These instincts are offset by others equally authentic. The love of the novel and different, which works against fatal inbreeding, is also part of the mechanism of evolutiion. Invincible impulses of sympathy with life as life move us even in contemplation of the growing green things, still more as we watch the play or the suffering of animals, and above all, as we face other human beings. It was a none-too-fine-feeling comedian of the harsh Roman breed who let fall the pregnant word that "nothing human is alien to me." Coöperation and mutual aid also are, as Drummond and Kropotkin have demonstrated, early and important factors in evolution, playing an increasingly large part as the level of life rises. Now coöperation of an advanced type implies and requires difference; it involves division of labor in the sense of specialization along differing lines.

Thus instinct makes for friendly as well as for unfriendly relations with those unlike ourselves.

But man is a creature not of instinct only, but also of reason. I here use the term reason not in the somewhat discredited sense of mere ratiocination, but to mean all

power to apprehend truth; and not only this, but also the will trained and stimulated to realize the moral and intellectual vision.

What then does reason indicate in this complex problem of race relations?

The history of the human species, on both its bodily and its spiritual side, has been a constant intertwining of two sorts of development.

There has been on the one hand the tendency to evolve specialized types. Remoter and more isolated habitats favor the preservation and accentuation of racial peculiarities, and ultimately the creation of a pure race, of a highly differentiated civilization, of a group with a maximum of internal uniformity and of external difference.

Along with this specializing and segregating tendency have gone the tendencies, biological and political, that lead to intermixture. America is not the first melting-pot—nor the last.

The situation is unduly simplified unless it is realized that the kinds of likeness and unlikeness are manifold and that they do not vary together. The factors of speech, religion, community of history and tradition, conscious group unity, unite and divide men even more powerfully than racial (i. e., physical) likeness or unlikeness.

All these things combine and separate in the most complex ways. For instance, on the one hand, English, French, and Gaelic-speaking Canadians are united by a political bond. On the other hand, common speech and culture bind together English-speaking folk across political boundaries. Ties of religion and a common history band Jews together across lines of country, speech and stage of development. The mere racial tie is probably the weakest of all.

The colored people of America may recognize some sentimental bond with the African and the Solomon Islander, but Booker T. Washington is infinitely more closely bound to President Wilson than to a Kru boy. The peculiarly near sense of unity of the colored people in America is due to a common past and a common present task, not mainly to blood relationship; for the group contains a very large proportion of persons who, on a purely racial basis, are nearer white than black.

We might suppose that the strongest groups would be those in which the greatest number of cohesive forces combined,—groups with a common physical type, a common speech, religion, and culture. This may be true in a small body like Athens or Florence. Yet as these instances recur to us we recall that perhaps no polities known to history were torn by more bitter internal enmities.

However this may be, too great uniformity over too wide an area would appear to be a very dubious advantage. It may be questioned if the bourgeoisie of France and the American middle class do not suffer from excessive uniformity.

A "dead level" is deadening, and especially so if it is not evolved from within, but imposed from without. The tendency to fuse, and to obliterate differences, appears to need the counterpoise of the other force which creates new unlikenesses, fresh types; and this in turn needs the growth of the power of mutual comprehension, appreciation, and sympathy to prevent divergence from meaning dissension.

There has been a school of thought, now gradually going out of date after having been influential for over a century, which laid the greatest possible emphasis on national groups. These nationalities were conceived, with

the *naïveté* of the period before the rise of scientific ethnology, to be racially akin because speaking a common tongue. A veritable world of myths was created as to national and racial entities.

The rise of the feeling of nationality, the worship almost of the national idea, played a great part in nineteenth century history. It worked, and often with success, to break up composite political units. It powerfully helped Germany and Portugal and Russia to fling off Napoleon, it gave unity and independence to Italy, it helped to free from obsolete and degrading tyranny Greece and other victims of Turkish rule. With the shibboleth of Pan-Slavism, it strengthened Russian influence in lands of kindred tongues. It revived dying vernaculars like Gaelic, and Welsh, and Bohemian, and Slovenian. It enriched the literature of the Romantic period with folklore, and folk tales, and ballads, and gave to music new and infinitely to be cherished notes in folk-song.

Along with this went the pseudo-science of race, as expounded by the German writer, Chamberlain, and others, with its effort to interpret human history in terms of the innate superiority of one racial group.

Conceivably the human species might have produced one superior "sport," a type so beyond all others at all points that the best possible issue would be the elimination of all the rest. I say carefully, elimination, because subjugation involves not only the perpetuation of inferior types but their perpetuation in a condition making, in itself, for inferiority and demoralization.

Such an emergence of a race of definitive superiority might conceivably have occurred. Such demonstrably did not occur. Not the dolichocephalic blonde, not the Aryan, not the white race, can make good any such claim. Pro-

fessor Boas' most interesting little book, "The Mind of Primitive Man," is wholesome as well as interesting reading, with its conclusion that science knows no inferior race. With all our unescapable group bias we can yet discern that the people who gave us the Parthenon, Phidias, and Plato, the stock from which sprang the prophets, the psalmists and Jesus of Nazareth, the race of Zoroaster, the India of Buddha and Tagore, the culture of China, the art and the Bushido ethic of Japan, do not ask a merely condescending attention of the blonde European.

National movements, in so far as they make for independence, freedom to develop the genius of a group, and opportunity for self-expression, are all to the good. But when national feeling means the attempt to dominate alien groups, to force a type of culture upon others from the outside, it is a curse.

No lover of the distinctively human, no lover of art, music, literature, language, of the picturesque, the intimate, the lovely, can fail to deplore the effects of the steam-roller process. The dull epochs of history are those like the Hellenistic and the later Roman, in which one culture has dominated all others. With modern means of communication and with all that makes for cosmopolitanism, there is again a tendency to flatness, to undue similarity, to loss of local color and of the accent of developed and refined differentness.

If by some great catastrophe Europe became all Teuton, or all Slav, or all "Anglo-Saxon," or all Latin, that would be a tragic day, not simply for the cultures that went under, but for all. It would be tragic because for any type, even the most inconspicuous, to perish with its gift not fully developed, its contribution not wholly made, is an irreplaceable loss. But not only for this reason. As has

been pointed out by others, it appears to be the case that the great flowerings of humanity are apt to come from the stimulating contacts of different civilizations. They may not come necessarily so, nor solely so,—we know too little to say; but this certainly seems one active cause of progress.

The Renaissance sprang from such a fertilization by the Greek genius, living in its physical death. The period of the Crusades might be cited with the same moral, or, in our time, Japan electrified by contact with Europe.

Such contacts, to be vivifying, must be unconstrained. The human spirit, acting freely, selects that which it can digest and work over to its own ends, the rest seems to pass it by, as that which is unfit for his age passes by the reading child. If Japan had been conquered and had had foreign ways forced upon it whether it wanted them or not, it might have been Europeanized, but in how destructive a sense! In that case, too, the Western world would probably have missed the reciprocal gain which its art has drawn from Japanese influence. Men are less prone to learn from their victims.

The social philosophy that I am trying to set forth does not touch on all the springs of the war that is devastating our lives, but it touches some deep-lying influences that make for war.

National vanity, and national greed masking under national vanity, give us the war cries of the jingo and the imperialist, and of *pan* this and *pan* that. The dogma of the white man's burden veils the colony-grabbing that lies behind it. The idea that it is a national mission to force others into the national mold, springs from contempt for those who differ from us and takes on a thousand forms. In the United States we call it assimilation, using the

same word to cover the most desirable and the most undesirable relations with the newly come elements of the population, and we shall be lucky if our fanatics of race do not yet lead us into war with the East.

Elsewhere, it is the contest of rival nations to enlarge their linguistic boundaries at the expense of their neighbors. This is not peculiar to any one group. Italy is at work to Italianize Istria, Trieste, and the Albanian littoral; Greeks and Bulgarians created a veritable fever by their rival efforts in Macedonia; Russia is forcing herself on Finland, and Germany has been doing the same thing in her Polish territory.

This present war is not a war of races, as some have tried to make out. It is plain enough that it is not, if we note two facts. First, it cuts across "race" lines, for it is a war of (mainly Teutonic) English, Latins, Slavs, and Japanese against South Germans, the largely Slavic Prussians, Magyars of Hungary, Slavs of Hungary and of Austria, and Turks. Secondly, none of these groups are races at all, in any strict sense. The lines of difference are mainly lines of difference of language and culture. Racially, every nation in Europe is an intricate congeries of racial elements.

Nevertheless, while not a race war, yet racial or national arrogances, greeds, fears, intolerances are in part at least to blame for the war. It can be understood only as the outcome of a state of mind, of ideas and perverse idealisms.

As the final outcome of the wars of religion was toleration, so let us pray that out of the clashes fomented by national chauvinism may issue that internationalism which is consistent with a mutual regard for national personali-

ties and an appreciation of and pleasure in the contrasts of different developments of the human spirit.

If we would end war, let us enlarge our hearts and rejoice in the otherness of others.

By Emily Greene Balch,
Professor of Political and Social Science, Wellesley College.

APPENDIX I

Addresses of Peace Organizations that Are Referred to in Chapter IV

The International Peace Bureau, Berne, Switzerland.

The Interparliamentary Union, Brussels, Belgium.

Federation of International Polity Clubs. Geo. W. Nasmyth Ph.D., president, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

The World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

American Association for International Conciliation, 407 W. 117th Street, New York City.

The Church Peace Union, Frederick Lynch D.D., Secretary, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

The American School Peace League, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston, Mass.

The American Peace Society, Arthur Deerin Call, Executive Director, Colorado Building, Washington D. C.

The Woman's Peace Party, National Chairman, Miss Jane Addams, Headquarters, 116 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.